



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Transferred to the
LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN


UW



William Ward Wight.



From the LIBRARY of
WILLIAM WARD WIGHT
Milwaukee, Wisconsin
1849-1931
President of the Society
1904-1910





CHURCH HISTORY IN BRIEF.

BY THE
REV. JAMES C. MOFFAT, D.D.,
PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY, PRINCETON.

PHILADELPHIA :
PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION,
1334 CHESTNUT STREET.

COPYRIGHT, 1885, BY
THE TRUSTEES OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION.

All Rights Reserved.



WESTCOTT & THOMSON,
Stereotypers and Electrotypers, Philada.

CHAPTER VI.

	PAGE
EXTENSION OF PROMISE.—DISTRIBUTION OF THE LAND.—SUPERIORITY OF JOSEPH IN THE THEOCRATIC COMMONWEALTH . .	28

CHAPTER VII.

THE THEOCRATIC MONARCHY.—THE SUPERIORITY OF JUDAH.—SCHOOLS OF THE PROPHETS.—A NEW PERIOD IN THE PROGRESS OF REVELATION.—FINAL DIVISION BETWEEN JUDAH AND EPHRAIM	32
--	----

CHAPTER VIII.

DIMINISHING CHURCH.—A NEW PERIOD OF REVELATION.—EVANGELICAL PROPHETS	38
--	----

CHAPTER IX.

AN UPRISING OF HEATHEN RATIONALISM.—LATER JUDAISM . .	41
---	----

PART II.

(A. D. I-100.)

THE HOPE OF ISRAEL REVEALED.

CHAPTER I.

CHRIST	51
------------------	----

CHAPTER II.

APOSTOLIC CHURCH AMONG THE JEWS	55
---	----

CHAPTER III.

THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH SEVERED FROM THE JEWISH NATION .	66
---	----

PART III.

*THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH UNDER THE
ORDINARY MEANS OF GRACE.*

PERIOD FIRST.

(A. D. 100-325.)

CHAPTER I.

	PAGE
APOSTOLIC FATHERS	71

CHAPTER II.

PRIMITIVE APOLOGISTS	76
--------------------------------	----

CHAPTER III.

CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS	85
-----------------------------	----

CHAPTER IV.

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE IN LATIN	98
---	----

CHAPTER V.

GROWTH OF THE HIERARCHY (261-325 A. D.)	107
---	-----

PERIOD SECOND.

(325-1517.)

UNION OF THE CHURCH WITH THE STATE.

CHAPTER I.

THE NEW IMPERIAL CONSTITUTION (325-395)	120
---	-----

CHAPTER II.

	PAGE
DOCTRINAL DEFINITION (395-451)	129

CHAPTER III.

PATRIARCHAL RIVALRY (451-607)	142
---	-----

CHAPTER IV.

HUMILIATION OF THE EASTERN CHURCHES.—INCREASING POWER OF THE WESTERN PATRIARCHATE (607-752)	147
--	-----

CHAPTER V.

EARLY PAPAL SUCCESS.—ORGANIZATION OF THE NATIONAL CHURCHES OF THE WEST (752-880)	158
---	-----

CHAPTER VI.

PAPAL DEGENERACY AND REFORM (880-1054)	168
--	-----

CHAPTER VII.

THE SUMMIT OF PAPAL PROSPERITY (1054-1305)	177
--	-----

CHAPTER VIII.

SCHOLASTICISM	190
-------------------------	-----

CHAPTER IX.

PREACHING AND MENDICANT ORDERS	196
--	-----

CHAPTER X.

DISSENTING SECTS	200
----------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XI.

	PAGE
PAPAL DECLINE.—SUPERIORITY OF COUNCILS.—REVIVAL OF LEARNING (1305-1418)	206

CHAPTER XII.

PROGRESS OF THE REVIVAL OF LEARNING.—REVIVAL OF RELIG- ION.—OF THE STUDY OF SCRIPTURE.—OF PREACHING (1418-1517)	220
---	-----

PERIOD THIRD.

(A. D. 1517-1885.)

CHAPTER I.

THE REFORMATION CRISIS (1517-1530)	235
--	-----

CHAPTER II.

CONFESSIONS AND RELIGIOUS WARS (1530-1648)	248
--	-----

CHAPTER III.

REFORMATION IN THE BRITISH ISLES	263
--	-----

CHAPTER IV.

REFORMATION IN SCOTLAND (1528-1560)	283
---	-----

CHAPTER V.

THE CHURCHES OF ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND UNDER THE UNION OF THE CROWNS	292
---	-----

CHAPTER VI.

REFORMATION IN IRELAND (1535-1642)	298
--	-----

CHAPTER VII.

	PAGE
THE LONG PARLIAMENT.—PURITAN RULE	302

CHAPTER VIII.

THE BRITISH CHURCHES IN THE RESTORATION.—PRELATIC RULE (1660-1688)	313
---	-----

CHAPTER IX.

CHURCHES IN THE BRITISH ISLES DURING THE REVOLUTION .	320
---	-----

CHAPTER X.

THE YEAR 1648 AS AN ECCLESIASTICAL EPOCH (1648-1790) .	327
--	-----

CHAPTER XI.

THE GREEK CATHOLIC CHURCH	337
-------------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XII.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH (1648-1774)	352
---	-----

CHAPTER XIII.

POLITICAL CHANGES AFFECTING THE CHURCHES	372
--	-----

CHAPTER XIV.

THE PROTESTANT CHURCHES FROM THE PEACE OF WESTPHALIA TO THE EVE OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION	376
---	-----

CHAPTER XV.

THE REFORMED CHURCHES	388
---------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XVI.

	PAGE
THE RATIONALIST REVOLUTION (since 1790)	397

CHAPTER XVII.

REVIVAL AMONG THE REFORMED CHURCHES ON THE CONTINENT OF EUROPE	414
---	-----

CHAPTER XVIII.

LATER ROMANISM	420
--------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XIX.

BRITISH CHURCHES SINCE 1688	425
---------------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XX.

THE AMERICAN CHURCHES	439
---------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XXI.

AMERICAN CHURCHES AFTER THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE	460
---	-----

CHAPTER XXII.

THE EVANGELIZATION OF THE WORLD	482
---	-----



PART I.

THE PRIMAL FALL AND PROMISE.

CHURCH HISTORY IN BRIEF.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

IN the oldest records of the world the principal topic is religion. Those records belong to the most frequented seats of human habitation. They are monuments, written and pictorial, of Egypt, Babylonia and Assyria, and books of Palestine, Persia, India and China. Some of them come to us from more than two thousand years before Christ. That which brings a sober narrative from the highest antiquity is the part of the book of Genesis preceding the history of Abraham. In all of these records the chief formal elements of religion are the same. The idea of God, obedience to him, worship in prayer and sacrifice and hopes of deliverance from the ills of life by divine intervention appear everywhere in the written remains of primitive human thinking.

In the manner of observing worship there is also a remarkable similarity, even to the details of sacrifice, in places so far apart as Egypt and China, the differences being due to the various meanings attributed to those primary elements and the additions made to them.

Church history, as distinguished from a general history of religions, *is the narrative of a spiritual progress in human society*. The great interests concerned in it are the revelation of a Saviour for sinners in the process of its effects; human nature as fallen and as changed by grace; and the community of professing believers in revelation—their constitutional order, their observances, the development of their creed, their relations to the world and hopes of a future life.

Such are the dramatic persons present or implied in Church history all the way through. From the beginning it is actuated by a promise sustaining the interest of a growing expectation.

CHAPTER II.

THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

WHEN man, by yielding to temptation, had incurred the penalty of death, the hope was extended to him of ultimate victory over the tempter and of a way to escape death through the conditions implied in sacrifice. An originally-constituted sinful nature would have been incurable of sin; the holy being, fallen under temptation, needs only to be regenerated, delivered from the bondage of the superinduced evil. The evil pervades the whole nature; but man needs only a spiritual cleansing to be holy as his Creator designed. The method of that cleansing, or sanctification, is provided by the Creator himself.

The history of sacrifice, through all its course in revelation, points toward Him who was to triumph over death. The promise therein wrapped up, with its gradual unfolding, its partial fulfillments, its successive enlargements until its fulfillment in Christ, its vaster enlargement by him into an expectancy to be further revealed in the future, presents the normal line of Church history from the fall of man to the end of time.

The aim of that promise is the restoration of man to communion with God, to which the believer's hope is elicited and quickened by every additional revelation.

The Church is a Church because it is a society elect according to faith in that promise. *Ecclesia*, in classical Greek usage, meant "an assembly of elect persons." *Kyriaké*, an adjective signifying "the Lord's," applied to *ecclesia*, gave it a Christian meaning: *ecclesia kyriaké* was the assembly of the Lord's elect. Christians in different lands have retained one or other of these words, modified by their respective habits of pronunciation. The French retain the noun in their *église*, and the English and Scotch the adjective: "kyrk," or "kirk," is *kyriaké* shortened, and "church" is from "kyrk," as "Chester" from *castra*.

Ecclesia implies election. Between the Lord and his people the choice is mutual, for so alone can it be communion. God took the first step. As soon as man sinned Christ entered on his work as the Saviour. Whatever the amount of instruction given, it was not readily accepted by men. The penalty of sin was death; sacrifice typified the substitute for sinful man. Such was its import as offered by Abel. But the expiatory meaning was overlooked by the early generations, who went utterly astray under the impulse of a godless self-reliance. The sin of Cain was that of presenting a merely rational worship which contained no divine meaning. In that he was followed by all the family of Adam until the days of Seth. Those who thereafter called upon the name of the Lord, though some were men of eminent piety, were so little followed that only one household was exempted from the destruction which fell upon deep and hopeless iniquity. The antediluvian world did not make their election of God.

CHAPTER III.

NOACHIC COVENANT.

AFTER the Deluge the previously-revealed religion was retained in the family of Noah, and, with large additions of divine favor, again offered equally to the acceptance of all mankind. Special statutes were enacted touching man's place as a ruler over the creatures and the preservation of his own race, with assurance of divine provision to that end. Noah, upon descending from the ark, built an altar and offered a burnt offering upon it, and the Lord accepted it as worship. This implied the fundamental elements of religion—namely, confession of sin, trust for salvation in the meaning of sacrifice, and approach to God in supplication thereby. On that basis God now added a new covenant, which comprehended grants, commands and promises.

I. The grant of dominion in the earth was renewed, but henceforth to be exercised over animals by inspiring them with fear. Permission was given to use animal food, but not with the blood. Blood was to be held sacred as the channel of life and the symbol of life in ritual service.

II. The command to multiply and replenish the earth was renewed. A special declaration was issued that every man should be held under obligation to care for the life of his neighbor and defend it

against violence, and sentence was pronounced against the shedder of human blood, that by man should his blood be shed.

III. The promises were such as to give confidence in the love of God to man. The ground was not to be cursed any more for man's sake; all living creatures were not again to be smitten as had been done in the Flood; and the order of the seasons was to continue undisturbed while earth remains.

God made known his will by revealing himself to the patriarch, who became thereby the prophet of his time. He was also its priest in the duties of sacrifice, and, being the head of the race descended from him, he united in himself all three offices of instruction, of religion and of government.

All colonies from the original patriarchal home carried with them the forms of religion observed by Noah. In Egypt, in Ethiopia, in Babylonia, in Assyria, in Greece and in India, or wherever they settled, they carried their belief in the existence of God and worshiped him in prayer and sacrifice.

But in course of time the conception of God became variously degraded. Some tribes, retaining faith in the one God as personal and near to his true worshiper, sought by use of images to represent him bodily. The same divine person, as worshiped in different places—as Baal on Hermon or Baal in Tyre—gradually assumed the characteristics of different deities, and polytheism followed idolatry, by multiplying the shrines of one god. By others, as the Hindoos, God was conceived of as living in all things, and as manifesting himself not only in human personality, but also

in the external world. Objects of nature were accordingly personified as divine, and God, in the sun, in the moon, in the stars, in fire, in the air, in the storm, seemed existent in many persons; so that the worshiper stood in no need of a fabricated idol. Nature herself furnished the object of adoration. But after the erection of enclosed temples, images of natural objects often took the place of the real. Great human benefactors after their death grew upon the veneration of their fellow-men to the rank of deity. With the idea of generation thus introduced, and the growth of superstition, the number of gods increased.

In like manner, rites and ceremonies multiplied around the few and simple original observances of worship. Every nation, after its own style, was in course of time burdened with a complicated ceremonial, rendering necessary a numerous priesthood versed in its details. Such changes were not made in levity, but with the intensest earnestness of the human heart, and, beyond all doubt, in the belief that they were true religion, and were successively introduced, by imperceptible steps, as improvements upon the worship of God. But each step covered its predecessor, until the starting-point of the progress was lost sight of entirely. The formalism of religion was retained and increased, while its spiritual meaning vanished away, was forgotten, buried under some merely human conception or mysterious rite—mysterious because not understood.

CHAPTER IV.

ABRAHAMIC COVENANT.

BEFORE the truth had everywhere entirely deserted the forms of religion, Abraham (in the descent of Shem) was called away from Ur of the Chaldees, in the South of Babylonia, and from the rapidly-accumulating errors of a great public, to become the patriarch of a new dispensation of mercy. On the sparsely-occupied pastures of Canaan, where the people were not of his kindred, he was severed from the corruptions of attractive society. It was now revealed that all nations of the earth should be blessed in him. Thence onward the chief of the Abrahamic race was heir of that expectation. Faith in divine promise was cultivated from age to age by more specific expectations definitely created—fulfillment long deferred, but always complete—until it became hereditary. An outlook to some good, confidently relied upon in the future, became a national feature of the Israelitish people. For them there was always light on the horizon and always faith in the coming day. They were set apart to bear testimony before the world to the divine purpose for man's redemption, and were to feel themselves enveloped in that vocation. The mark of circumcision was set upon them—a token of the covenant betwixt them and God; sacrifice was to them the sacrament of atonement, and social intercourse with the heathen was to be

shunned. The promise of posterity, through whom the nations were to be blessed, was made a discipline whereby faith was to be fortified and dependence upon God and a sense of nearness to him were to be inwrought.

The first birth on which the hope rested was delayed until, in the order of nature, it could no longer be expected. After it had been realized, the sole heir of the covenant was by divine command subjected to the form of sacrifice and resurrection. Abraham was himself favored with prophetic foresight of Him whom that symbolical sacrifice typified. The divine meaning of sacrifice must be so impressed that it shall never be forgotten.

Belief in the divine promise, as it thus stood to Abraham, became the first duty of his descendants, and all the events of their history turned upon discipline of faith. At the end of two hundred years the race amounted to only one household. A promise of possession in the land of Canaan stood before them, but for more than four hundred years they owned no land beyond a burial-place. Such difficulties were also thrown in their way as to discourage all mere human enterprise, and demand practical trust in the miraculous interposition of God. Before they can possess a country they must be a nation, and before they can be an agricultural nation—which during their residence in Canaan it was in the purpose of God they should be—they must learn the habits and arts of agricultural life. When the family of Jacob had increased to seventy persons, they were removed to Egypt, where best they could receive that necessary training, and where they were reduced by compulsion to acquire it.

Hard bondage in all manner of service in the field imposed also its consequence in growing ignorance. They were on the point of forgetting the hopes of their fathers. A Hebrew infant exposed in a little ark among the reeds of the Nile is found by the king's daughter, adopted and brought up under the highest education in the land; and thus is Moses prepared to be a prince and a leader. But he needs also a spiritual culture which could not be obtained in the palace of Pharaoh. Forty years of communing with himself and with God in the desert were crowned with a direct revelation to prepare him for the ministry of reviving the faith of his people and effecting their deliverance.

CHAPTER V.

A MONOTHEISTIC REFORM.—THE DIVINE PROMISE IN THE LANGUAGE OF PRESCRIBED RITES.

MEANWHILE, all the nations of whom history has anything to say had become so degenerate in religion that many earnest men the world over felt that a reformation was urgently demanded. That there had been a time of greater simplicity and purity was not altogether beyond the reach of investigation by the learned; but in what that early purity consisted no man seems rightly to have understood. All the reformers of that epoch, which covered we know not how much time—a hundred years, perhaps more—had one idea in common; namely, to return to the worship of one only God. The Chinese king T'ang, the Aryan reformer Zarathustra, the fourth Amenhotep, king of Egypt, whatever their misconceptions, agreed on that fundamental point. The Aryan and the Hebrew alone held their ground—the former by means of the sacred books of the Avesta, and the latter by the Pentateuch and the sacred institutions delivered at Sinai. All the rest were submerged in the irresistible tide of increasing polytheistic idolatry. None save the Hebrews in their conception of an earlier purity recovered the divine promise. For religion's sake the Hebrews must be removed from Egypt somewhere out of the world for

a time. Their exode was effected by such an array of miracles as completely to confound the science and religion of Egypt, and to demonstrate the existence of the one God, before whom the so-called gods of the heathen were nothing but human mistakes. It occurred at the close of a four hundred and thirty years' residence in that country.

An enslaved people had now to be constituted a free nation with courage and prudence for all that a free nationality demands. To that end the legislation at Sinai and a residence of forty years in the Wilderness were devoted. The promise was renewed and its contents were spread out for the first time in the revealed ceremonial—a system of signs full of spiritual meaning, and yet in their externals, many of them, familiar to residents in Egypt.

Then, and afterward for many generations, the believing and faithful observance of the ceremonies and of the law as expressing the purpose of Jehovah was the way of salvation. Meanwhile, their spiritual import was progressively revealed. The potency of an unseen God behind all those signs and ceremonies—a God who was not only to be believed in, but practically obeyed as their King, their only King—was the grand imperial thought in their religion. It filled with venerable meaning every sign which he had ordained.

The revelation at Sinai contained three classes of instructions—first, a moral law consisting of the first principles of right action for man in all his relations to God and his fellow-men; secondly, a ceremonial law specially addressed to the religious observances of the theocratic nation; and thirdly, a system of civil

laws for the direction of the various ministers of the government and to guide in the administration of justice. These three, although in themselves distinct, were, owing to the theocratic and sacerdotal character of the state and the circumstances of their delivery, intermingled in the order of institution. The course of time so completely separated them that, while the civil element ceased to be in force with the independence of the nation, and the ceremonial became impracticable with the destruction of the temple and the expulsion of the people from Palestine, the moral element remains unchanged, having taken its place as the moral code of the Christian world.

The tribal organization was now comprehended within the revealed constitution by which all the tribes were united in the bonds of one nation. One God—who also was their King—one religion, one system of worship, one temple and one sacerdotal tribe for all the tribes, and the same general assemblies, were the bonds of union holding all the sons of Israel together as one nation. Their religion now presented a high symbolical ritual imbued with a prophetic spiritual meaning. The one national aim was to *receive and conserve divine revelations until they should be fulfilled in the incarnation of the Messiah*. All Israel was thereby, in one sense, a priest-nation for mankind.

From the Wilderness the Israelites carried to their occupancy of Canaan a complete national constitution fully equipped for their divinely-appointed work.

The chief priesthood, their highest ordinary office, was established in Aaron and in the descent of his oldest son, subsequently of his younger son, and, by

King David, of both sons. Aaron died on Mount Hor in the beginning of the fortieth year of the sojourn in the Wilderness.

Approaching the land of Canaan from the side of the eastern desert, Israel had to cross a country possessed by the Amorites. Applying to their king, Sihon, for permission to cross peacefully, it was refused them. Sihon's attempt to drive them back into the desert resulted in his own defeat and in the seizure of his territory by the victors. He had recently taken it from the Moabites. The king of Moab, seeing one of his dangerous neighbors overthrown, conceived a plan to make the other harmless, and sent for the celebrated prophet Balaam to curse them, and thereby remove from them the favor of their God. The prophecy of Balaam proved a blessing. Moab did not risk the war, but by the private advice of Balaam took measures to seduce Israel into sin through the worship of Baal-peor. This led to the destruction of many lives, avenged by the army of Israel upon their tempters. Og, king of Bashan, undertook, without cursing or seduction, to repel them by force, but was defeated and slain. All his dominions also were added to the conquest of Israel.

At their own request the two tribes of Reuben and Gad, with half of Manasseh, received their portions in those lands east of the Jordan on condition that they should help their brethren in war for the Land of Promise on the western side.

Moses, having appointed his successor in leadership and pronounced his last blessing upon the people, ascended Mount Nebo, beheld the Promised Land and died.

The miraculous crossing of the Jordan and capture of Jericho gave assurance that, although Moses was dead, God was still the present Monarch of Israel, and the faithful learned to trust him more directly.

The succeeding conquest was effected in the siege of Ai and the two great battles of Beth-horon over the united kings of the South, and of Merom over the similarly united kings of the North. Minor battles and reductions of strongholds ended the war.

The Israelites were not tempted by success to pursue a further career of victory. Without completing the entire subjugation of all that to which the promise entitled them, they hastened to lay aside their arms and settle down to the culture of what was already secured.

CHAPTER VI.

EXTENSION OF PROMISE.—DISTRIBUTION OF THE LAND.

—SUPERIORITY OF JOSEPH IN THE THEOCRATIC
COMMONWEALTH.

IN its material import the promise to Abraham of a country in possession was now fulfilled in the very country promised and half as much more.

But another light was thrown upon the future and its expectations in the farewell words of Moses: "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken"—words which the Israelites could not understand to be fulfilled in Joshua, nor afterward in Samuel, nor in any of the later prophets.

Distribution of the land on the western side was made by lot, except in the case of Judah and Joseph. Hebron had been promised to Caleb by Moses; his tribesmen received their portion in the neighborhood of their chief. The petition of Ephraim, on the ground of being a numerous people, was respected. The half tribe of Manasseh got their portion immediately to the north, and Benjamin immediately to the south, of Ephraim, while the eastern half of Manasseh lay directly over against the western. Thus did the children of Rachel occupy an almost connected territory in the heart of the tribes.

In Ephraim also was the capital city, Shiloh, where the tabernacle was set up. That structure—at once the sole temple of national worship and the palace of the invisible Monarch—represented the national union. The high priest was the prime minister of Jehovah in sacred things, the sons of Aaron were the attendants of the court, and the other Levites were distributed in forty-eight small cities throughout the tribes for public instruction and professions connected, not with tribal duties, but with the national constitution.

For military and civil exigences judges were called as the occasion demanded. They were not ordinary officers, and were always called for the special occasion by the invisible Monarch whose ministers they were. Subsequent to Joshua, fifteen judges are recorded as having ruled Israel.

Surrounded by heathen, with many of the Canaanitish heathen tolerated among them, the Israelites were constantly exposed to the temptation of idolatrous rites. Holding possession of their lands on condition of fidelity to revealed religion, they were repeatedly punished for infidelity by invasion and plunder. Six times were they thus chastised—first, by Mesopotamia; second, by Moabites; third, by Philistines and northern Canaanites; fourth, by Midianites and Amalekites; fifth, by Philistines and Ammonites; and sixth, by Philistines alone.

After Abdon, the twelfth judge, the nation became greatly disorganized and its religion corrupted by heathen practices. The ark of the covenant, containing the law of God, had come to be regarded with idolatrous superstition. Taken into battle as a palladium, it was

captured by their Philistine enemies, and, although soon restored to the land of Israel, was never replaced in Shiloh, but remained in the keeping of a private family until David erected a new tabernacle for it in Jerusalem. The old tabernacle was removed from Shiloh to Nob, and afterward to Gibeon, where it stood at the time of Solomon's accession to the throne.

The priests abode by the tabernacle and conducted the services as they could, but that was very defectively. Revealed religion was disintegrated by general neglect on the part of the people and the lack of any adequate leader. When Samuel became old enough to assume that office, the nation was deeply heathenized and lay under a crushing Philistine domination. Samuel first recalled them to their allegiance to Jehovah. He then organized them into a force which repelled the invader, and proceeded to reconstruct the government. But even to his old age all depended upon his personal efforts.

Not unreasonably, therefore, did the people in their weakness feel the want of a human minister of God to be their king. Samuel had practically been a king to them; and when he shall die, who can take his place? Not his sons: they are profligate. Some one of his choice they are willing to trust. Better for them—and so he told them—to have returned to the pure worship of Jehovah and his allegiance. But in this as in many other things they were controlled by heathen example. Samuel, taking counsel of God, selected a king.

Saul, the first king, never fully apprehended his royal duties nor the true position of a king of Israel between

Jehovah and his people. He repelled invaders, but never organized an administration, either civil or religious—never was more than a great chieftain who could bestir himself for an emergency. Another had to be chosen, who, fully recognizing the monarchy of King Jehovah, should accept position as his minister and organize the nation and its government accordingly. The choice of David settled for ever the line of Jewish kings.

CHAPTER VII.

THE THEOCRATIC MONARCHY.—THE SUPERIORITY OF JUDAH.—SCHOOLS OF THE PROPHETS.—A NEW PERIOD IN THE PROGRESS OF REVELATION.—FINAL DIVISION BETWEEN JUDAH AND EPHRAIM.

THROUGH all the time of the judges superiority among the tribes was wielded by the family of Rachel, and the head of that was Ephraim, son of Joseph. From Reuben, the oldest son of Leah, the birthright had been transferred to Joseph, the oldest son of Rachel. But under the Abrahamic covenant not the first-born, but the heir of the promise, was the most highly favored. In the accession of David the superiority passed over to Judah with the submission, but not the cordial consent, of Ephraim, whose leadership the northern and eastern tribes never ceased to follow.

With the establishment of the temporal monarchy provision was made for the education of prophets, to be a check upon the king, disposed, as he naturally would be, to forget his allegiance to God. Samuel, the last of the judges, was also the first of that series of prophets which continued until after the Babylonish captivity. It appears that with his instructions commenced those schools in which youth were educated

with a view to certain duties belonging to the prophetic office. The school did not make the prophet: he was made such only by a call from God. He was a messenger from the invisible Monarch of Israel, and his credentials were the message which he bore. The prophets were the agents of progress and of the unfolding spiritual element in the revealed religion. They handled all subjects pertaining to the kingdom of Jehovah in Israel, whether moral, religious, literary, social or political, public or personal, national or international. While the priesthood upheld the formal typical service, prophecy urged onward the intellectual and spiritual growth which went to prepare the way for Him who was to fulfill all types.

Neither priest nor prophet was in his official capacity subordinate to the king, nor was the king subordinated to the sacerdotal class. All three were co-ordinate in the service of Jehovah.

A complete organization of the monarchy was effected by David. The public service was for the first time distributed into departments administered respectively by a commander-in-chief of the forces, a commander of the royal guards, a collector of revenue, a recorder, a secretary of state, two chief priests and a steward of the household. The ark of the covenant was brought from its captivity and deposited in a tabernacle prepared for it in Jerusalem, and both branches of the sons of Aaron were organized for the religious service. Divided into twenty-four orders—sixteen of the family of Eleazar, and eight of the family of Ithamar—each order in succession performed the duties of the tabernacle one week. The rest of the Levites

were similarly reorganized, arranged in orders and assigned to particular duties under their respective chiefs. Four thousand of them were employed as singers, under the direction of their chorus-leaders, Heman, Asaph and Jeduthan. Another large body performed on instruments, and the king himself furnished the largest number of the sacred songs. He consecrated the arts in which he excelled to the service of Jehovah.

Beginning with the central doctrine of the invisible God as King of Israel, the psalms of David celebrated his divine attributes as God and King and the intrinsic spirituality of his worship. Hebrew religion was not only revived in its purity: it also received some new features. The elements of music and song were greatly expanded; the tenderer aspects of the divine nature were more fully presented; a great advance was made in bringing out the relations of God to the individual worshiper as a protector and affectionate friend. Some facts of the promised One are now touched prophetically for the first time—the sonship in Godhead, the kingship in Israel and to the uttermost parts of the earth, and his descent according to the flesh in the line of David. There is also a predominance of light and joy and freedom in coming unto God, and an exaltation of spiritual worship as more acceptable to God than mere ceremonial.

Solomon's reign was a splendid blaze of excellence in art and literature, but all centring in the king himself and assuming more of a secular character than had hitherto belonged to Hebrew literature. The intellectual and governmental activity of the king wearied

out the people. Immediately after his death the tribe of Ephraim took occasion of the general dissatisfaction to promote revolt. The movement was of God, because of the latter unfaithfulness of Solomon. The northern and southern tribes, with Ephraim at their head, seceded from the house of David, leaving in loyalty to it only the tribes of Judah and Benjamin.

Jeroboam, in accordance with a prophecy that he should be king of the seceding tribes, returned from Egypt, and forthwith saw the prophecy fulfilled. To render the secession permanent he separated his people from the worship of God at Jerusalem, and, instead of it, set up, under the plea of greater convenience, images of calves—one at Bethel and the other at Dan—which were to represent Jehovah. Thus was the kingdom of Jeroboam fixed down to an idolatry from which it never departed except to go deeper into heathenism. The Levites, attached to the worship of Jehovah, withdrew to the kingdom of Judah; in their place Jeroboam made priests of whomsoever he found willing to serve in his new religion.

From the date of the separation onward the career of the ten tribes was one of persistent alienation from Jehovah. Exceptional cases of genuine piety were not lacking even in the worst times, but as a nation their history was a progressive degeneracy under the lead of a series of princes who seem to have aimed at assimilating their people to the heathen around them to perpetuate the alienation from Judah. Eight times were the reins of power transferred to a new dynasty, but the idolatry established by Jeroboam was never removed. Education in native idolatry prepared the

public mind for accepting from abroad one which was baser. Little more than fifty years had passed when the marriage of Ahab to a daughter of the king of Sidon brought the worship of Baal authoritatively into Israel.

The miraculous chastisement inflicted by the hand of Elijah had only a temporary effect. The extinction of the house of Ahab by Jehu removed Sidonian worship from the royal court, but failed to restore that of Jehovah to king or people. Constituted, as it had been, by Jeroboam, the priesthood ministering before the calves at Bethel and at Dan were a permanent barrier to all efforts for reformation. Worshipers of the God of Moses and of David were never more than a small dissenting body who conducted their devotions in private.

Great prophets were sent with alarming messages, but the obdurate nation heeded them not. Finally, error corrupted the prophets also: four hundred of them, in the latter days of Ahab, were ready to prophesy smooth things to please an idolatrous king. With king, priests and prophets alike alienated, all the agencies divinely appointed for the national direction were corrupted into agencies of evil. The strength inherent in a pure religion abandoned them. They became the plunder of foreign enemies, and finally their kingdom was overrun and utterly destroyed by Shalmanezar, king of Assyria. The strength of its population were carried captive, distributed in heathen cities and ultimately lost to the eye of history. A remnant left in their own land were mingled with foreign colonists sent in among them. The people of the northern

kingdom had ceased to be witnesses for the Hope of Israel—had lost all that should have distinguished them as Hebrews long before their deportation by Sargon. God, for their obdurate infidelity, removed them out of his sight.

CHAPTER VIII.

DIMINISHING CHURCH.—A NEW PERIOD OF REVELATION.—EVANGELICAL PROPHETS.

FROM the fall of Samaria the religion of promise was confined more strictly than ever to one kingdom consisting of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, with the sacerdotal house of Levi.

In Jerusalem the regal succession was unbroken in the line of David, and the fidelity of the crown and people to the God of David, although for a few years partially interrupted, never entirely failed. Consistently, the power of Judah was, upon the whole, greater, and lasted longer, than that of Israel. From the death of Solomon until the overthrow of the kingdom twenty kings reigned successively in that dynasty, eight more or less in the theocratic spirit; and one of the rest, after an heretical youth, repented and served Jehovah. The reigns of the pious kings were so much longer than those of the others that, taken together, out of the whole duration of the kingdom, amounting to three hundred and eighty-seven years, they covered two hundred and fifty.

Truth is kept alive in the earth only by persevering effort; and that most valuable of all truth with which the Hebrews were entrusted public attention was always ready to abandon when not under the guidance of faith-

ful and watchful ministers. The history of Judah presents a succession of declines and restorations of orthodoxy according to the fidelity or the infidelity of the monarch.

The first declension began with Rehoboam and continued in the reign of his son—in all, twenty years. A restoration followed under Asa and Jehoshaphat—sixty-six years. The marriage of Jehoram, son of Jehoshaphat, to Athaliah, daughter of Ahab and Jezebel, introduced Sidonian idolatry into the royal family of Judah. In the reign of her husband and, after his death, of her son, and then in her own usurpation, Athaliah set up the worship of Baal in Jerusalem, and sustained it eleven years. The line of David, and with it the worship of Jehovah, were restored in the coronation of Josiah, and continued through his and the next three reigns, amounting to one hundred and thirty-six years. The godless rule of Ahaz extended to sixteen years. It gave place to that of Hezekiah, whose reformation continued, with some variations, until the death of Josiah—one hundred and sixteen years. The next twenty-two years, with four successive kings, witnessed an unrelieved and final decline, ending in the transportation of the best of the people to Babylon. In every instance the spirit of decline was forgetfulness of the divine promise and the use of a ritual which had lost all meaning in relation to it.

In the sinking condition of the national depositaries of revelation the divine purpose halted not; the faithful minority were making progress in the knowledge of it. Prophets were favored with a wider range of vision, transcending the bounds of Judaism and look-

ing to a general diffusion of the truth. The language of Joel, which rejoicingly proclaims the coming time when the Spirit of God shall be poured out on all flesh, marks the opening of a new era in the history of ancient revelation. Israel's work as a depository is drawing to a close. It ought to have been better done; but, well done or ill, it must stand for what it is. The next step is the publication of its treasures over the world, so far as the world is prepared to receive or tolerate them.

The voice of prophecy followed into the land of their captivity that part of the people who remained faithful to Jehovah. When the line of kings has come to an end and priests have become cold in the cause, the worship of Jehovah is maintained in the earth by the prophets—by direct communication from on high. But for that, so far as we can see, the religion of the Hebrews would have gone down by the same course of degeneracy by which that of Egypt, Babylonia and all others had gone down. In the Hebrew mind there was a strong tendency to idolatrous ritualism: the superiority of the Hebrew religion was not due to development of the Hebrew nature from within.

CHAPTER IX.

AN UPRISING OF HEATHEN RATIONALISM.—LATER JUDAISM.

IN the sixth and fifth centuries before Christ the debasement of religion painfully impressed many of the wisest men at the great centres of population and power over the world. But the idea of God had by that time been so deeply sunk in stupid idolatry that reformers made little of it, if they did not reject it entirely. The movement was one of reason in revolt against the domination of demoralizing observances despotically imposed as service due to higher powers than human. In China the reform was conducted by Confucius, whose teachings were merely moral and political on the basis of the ancient sacred books which he edited. In India, Buddha dispensed with all gods and devised a transcendental scheme whereby men were expected to save themselves from all the ills of life. In Persia the great king Darius restored the purity of the Avestan faith, which was rational, as over-against the formalism of the Magi, which had invaded it. In Greece the teaching of Socrates belonged to the same general head, but from its superiority as philosophy was not accepted as a religion, though followed by some instead of religion. The work of Servius Tullius, though entirely political, determined

the spirit of Roman religion through the best days of the republic. Syria, Babylonia and Assyria saw their religion shattered to pieces by Persian conquest and contempt of idolatry. In the civilized world Egypt alone adhered to her superstitions without flinching.

Avestanism received a greatly-extended dominion by its connection with the Persian empire. Confucianism was accepted in China as a revival of the ancient national faith. But, above all, Buddhism succeeded in carrying the convictions of the multitude in all classes east of the Indus. West of the Tigris superstition held the ignorant; philosophy, the learned.

The great Oriental religions had each its sacred canon, consisting of a series of books accumulated by addition of one to another in a long succession of ages. In that growth by successive additions those heathen scriptures pursued the same course of degeneracy with those who believed in them, or with the popular religion itself. But in none of the declensions of the national faith did the Hebrew Scriptures ever participate; their progress in successive additions to their numbers is consistently toward a higher spirituality and a fuller unfolding of Messianic promise.

In Babylonia the Jews were not held in afflictive bondage, but permitted to follow what occupations they chose. Some were elevated to places of rank and trust, and many of them prospered so well that they ceased to regret the land of Judah. In course of time a new generation arose, among whom many regarded the place of their own birth with more love than that of their fathers. Others, actuated by nobler motives, longed for the restoration of their city and

temple and the unmutilated service of their heavenly King, and for the fulfillment of the divine promise, the expectation of which their adversities had not extinguished. At the end of fifty years from the destruction of Jerusalem, and of seventy from the first Babylonish captivity, the kingdom of Babylon being overthrown by the Medes and Persians, Cyrus distinguished the first year of his reign by issuing a decree permitting the Jews to return to Judea and rebuild their city and temple and ordering every facility to be furnished them to that end. With all this Cyrus believed himself to be charged by the one god whom he adored after his Avestan faith, and whom he identified with the God of those captives.

Only fifty thousand Jews availed themselves of the decree of Cyrus. They were led by Zerubbabel, grandson of Jehoiakim, the last king of Judah, and arrived on the site of their ancient capital just seventy years after its first humiliation under Nebuchadnezzar, and in the latter part of the year 536 B. C. The other captives took no part in the restoration, and the Samaritans who desired to join it were rejected on the ground of not being pure Hebrews in either birth or religion. Upon the death of Cyrus the offended Samaritans succeeded in persuading Cambyses that the rebuilding of Jerusalem would be detrimental to the interests of the Persian crown. In the second year of Darius Hystaspis the same representation was made to him, but met with no favor. Darius befriended the Jews, and under the exhortations of the prophets Haggai and Zechariah the work on the temple was completed in the sixth year of his reign.

By permission of Artaxerxes Longimanus, about 458 B. C., a second company of returning captives was conducted to Jerusalem under Ezra, a learned scribe, by whom, more than any other, was the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures revived. Thirteen years later, Nehemiah, cupbearer of the same monarch, obtained authority to proceed to Jerusalem and strengthen the defences of the city, which were proceeding slowly. In the work of restoration Ezra addressed himself to the interests of religion, and Nehemiah to those of civil government.

Completely cured of idolatry and of polytheism, to which they never afterward recurred, the Jews of Judea subsequently took the opposite extreme of Deism with a high ritualistic worship. Yet there never were lacking among them those who rightly understood and consistently observed their national religion in its historical and prophetic bearing, and who, in it and through it, looked for the consolation of Israel.

During the suppression of the regal and sacerdotal offices in the Captivity the prophets maintained the cause of revealed religion. Daniel and Ezekiel in Babylonia, and Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi among the restored, did not suffer the people to forget the invisible Monarch to whom their allegiance was due.

Afterward, when the priesthood was reinstated in the regular services, the prophetic office came to an end; and, the nation being subjected to the king of Persia, the chief priest became the highest officer of civil as well as of Church government among the Jews.

When Alexander of Macedon approached Jerusalem, the authorities of the city met him with all honor. From that day the Persian dominion was supplanted by the Greek. After the death of Alexander, 323 B. C., the Jewish nation was added by Ptolemy Lagus to his kingdom of Egypt, in which connection it enjoyed the free exercise of religion, until, in 203 B. C., it was transferred to the rule of the Greek kings of Syria. In 169 B. C. the attempt of Antiochus Epiphanes to force upon the Jews the religion of Greece gave occasion to the heroic resistance of the Maccabees. The successors of those patriotic priests became, from 141 B. C., the independent priest-kings of Judea. They ceased to be independent when, in 63 B. C., they submitted to Roman arbitration, but their heirs held the throne, as separate from the priesthood, until the death of the first Herod, 4 B. C.

Two thousand years before that date the divine promise of a Saviour had been completely lost out of heathen religion. The vague expectations to some extent prevailing in the reign of Augustus of a great personage about to appear with blessing to mankind was a floating fancy, contracted, apparently, from the freely-expressed hopes of numerous and widely-dispersed Hebrew exiles.

At that epoch the state of religion in the West of Asia and in Europe was one of great depression. The tide of heathen rationalism which four hundred years earlier had swept over all the great seats of civilization, protesting, in some quarters, against the degradation, stupidity and uselessness for all good, of the ethnic religions, and in other quarters introducing styles of

thinking which coolly set the popular religions aside without taking notice of them, had left, east of the Indus, two great philosophic religions which rejected all consideration of gods, west of the Tigris, as fruit of the Persian conquests, which carried in triumph monotheistic Avestanism, had left in utter confusion the formerly ruling systems of Babylonian and Syrian polytheism and shaken that of Egypt, and there, as well as in Greece, had presented philosophy as a substitute for religion and carried the convictions of the educated.

Confucianism and Buddhism were now in their prime and accepted in the farther East by vast multitudes. Greek philosophy did not pretend to be a religion and scorned the delusions of the ignorant populace. Between the Indus and the Tigris ruled the Parthians, worshiping after a degenerate Magism under which pure Avestanism was banished out of sight among the mountains. Roman religion—a legal patriotism at best—was now broken by the recent political revolution and by the introduction of many foreign superstitions, and the true faith of the Hebrews was retained by few. Everywhere the religious condition of the multitudes, to whom philosophies and philosophical creeds were inaccessible, was degraded to the utmost capacity of credulity.

Rome had within the preceding half century united the ruder West of Europe to the decaying civilizations on the Eastern Mediterranean. Parthian dominion lay as a barrier between that new empire and the culture of the East beyond the Indus.

Without restoring the prosperity of the ancient

provinces, good order and security, with great facilities for the diffusion of knowledge, were maintained by Roman legislation and arms. Freedom of intercommunication was promoted among all the provinces by one general language of business and polite society and literature in the East, and one in the West. With a knowledge of Greek and Latin men could travel over the empire and find an intelligent audience in every city. The arts and the wisdom of the East were easily, through the common heart of Rome, extended to the strong but rugged nations of the West, and at the time of the Saviour's birth the government of that vast dominion was in the hands of one man whose policy was peace. But there was little hope or enterprise among the nations under the rule of Augustus Cæsar: their spirit had been crushed. In the character of the best heathen a deep despondency prevailed, a sense of want which no earthly possessions could fill.

Practical morals were exceedingly base, and basest in the highest places of society. Not that men were ignorant of the difference between right and wrong—their theoretical morals were of a high order—but because they were without sufficient persuasives to righteousness; and the example of their gods could be adduced to justify or palliate any vice or crime. Their great lack was the lack of a saviour. They had nothing for which to hope.

The Jews were still in possession of Judea, but as a subject kingdom of the Roman empire. The territory once belonging to the kingdom of Jeroboam was occupied on both sides of the Jordan by a population of

mixed descent. Samaritans dwelt in the land of Ephraim and the western half of Manasseh, and Galileans in that of the more northern tribes.

Pure Jews were of three religious sects—Pharisees, who were traditionally orthodox and ritualistic; Sadducees, who were rationalists; and Essenes, who were ascetics. A few were spiritually-minded believers in the expected Messiah. Jews were then resident in almost every nation—west of the Indus, at least—and in their synagogues the Scriptures of promise were regularly read.

PART II.

(A. D. 1-100.)

THE HOPE OF ISRAEL REVEALED.

FIRST CHRISTIAN CENTURY.

ROMAN EMPERORS.	BISHOPS OF ROME.
Augustus died A. D. 14	No historical mention of bishops in Rome until after the apostle Paul's residence there, until A. D. 63, or perhaps he suffered there in 67. It is probable that—
Tiberius died 37	
Caius died 41	
Claudius 54	
Nero 68	
Galba 69	Peter also suffered there in the same year, A. D. 67.
Otho 69	
Vitellius 69	Linus is said to have succeeded Peter, and to have died in 78
Vespasian 79	
Titus 81	Cletus in 90
Domitian 96	Clement in 100
Nerva 98	
Trajan 117	

CHAPTER I.

CHRIST.

SUCH was the state of religion in the principal nations of the world when Jesus, the promised One, appeared. He was born in Bethlehem of Judea, in the reign of Augustus, and less than two years before the death of Herod I., king of Judea, which took place between March 13 and April 4 in the year 750 u. c.—earlier by at least four years than the common era indicates.

The Saviour was of pure Hebrew genealogy according to the flesh, but made his residence chiefly among the half-Gentile people of Galilee. His public ministry began with his baptism, when he was thirty years of age, and extended to three years and a few months. The social condition in which he was born was lowly, and yet, as his mother's husband was of the lineage of David, he inherited the birthright of the kings of Judah.

Historically, Jesus appeared to the eyes of the world as a teacher, and substantially his life, as a whole, was the fulfilment of all promises touching the Messiah. His manner of teaching was peculiar to himself. He never presented what he taught as a conclusion arrived at—neither as discovered nor as certified by reasoning—but purely as revelation. Nor did he reveal as hav-

ing learned from some higher intelligence, but as speaking of his own original knowledge. Not a word recorded of him is inconsistent with the holiness which we conceive of God. His instructions contained intelligence from the counsels of Heaven touching the nature of God's existence and his designs for man; they laid open the whole plan of redemption and the love of God to the world; they taught the purest, most comprehensive and effectual principles of morals and the way whereby believers are to be accepted as holy and brought near as children to God; and of Jesus himself, that he was the sole sufficient Sacrifice for sin, the Mediator of the new covenant and the eternal Son of God.

Jesus addressed the understanding of men, but demanded of them, first of all, an act of the heart—namely, trust in himself and love to him and to one another. His doctrines have been accompanied by a power to carry them directly to the heart and change the state of its affections, whereby, notwithstanding their depth and height and spirituality, they are adapted to all grades of capacity. The operation and the effect of his work are found in practice to be of such nature as he said they would be. His miracles were essential parts of his instructions, and his death and resurrection the supreme achievement which he came to effect. All, taken together, make a complete whole, which is the gospel. That revealed truth, with the ordinances of his appointment, he commanded his disciples to proclaim to all the world, and he assigned to them, under the Holy Spirit, the work of organizing the society of believers.

Thus divinely constituted through human agency was the Christian Church. Its history began with the descent of the Holy Spirit, on the first Pentecost after the ascension of Christ.

CHRISTIAN CHURCH HISTORY.

Christian history since the Lord's ascension consists, in its own progress, of FOUR GREAT PERIODS:

The first is that of *apostolic history*, in the end of which the Church ceased to enjoy the presence and counsels of inspired men who had seen the Lord.

The second is that which ended in *conferring upon Christianity religious supremacy in the Roman empire*—a period which extended from about the beginning of the second century until the year 324 A. D., formally recognized in the first general council of the Church, in 325.

The third is that of *union with the state and increasing bondage to the rule of legalism within the pale of the Church*, and extends to the first successful efforts for liberation, in and about 1517 A. D. In this long period are included sub-periods of much importance, as, (1) That which terminated in the Nestorian schism, about 431; (2) That which determined the separation of the great group of the Monophysite churches, in 553; (3), The terrible loss to the churches of the East and South in the first Mohammedan invasions, which began in 632; (4) The separation of the Catholic Church into Greek and Latin, in 1054; (5) The beginning of papal decline, in 1305.

The fourth great period is that of *the Protestant secession*, including the controversy for and against

the free publication of the gospel and its supreme authority in the Church, which is still going on.

Upon closer inspection it is found necessary to divide each of these periods into subordinate sections, on the same principle, but belonging more nearly to the inner progress or necessities of the Christian community. These divisions are not artificial, but constituted by the progress or condition of the Church itself, and, though affected more or less by external affairs, are intrinsic.

CHAPTER II.

APOSTOLIC CHURCH AMONG THE JEWS.

APOSTOLIC history consists of five minor sections.

I. The first, beginning with the day of Pentecost and closing with the death of Stephen, witnessed the descent of the Holy Spirit, with its transforming effect upon the character of the apostles; the sermon of Peter, by which about three thousand were added to the number of believers; and the organization of the Christian Church. All that believed were together and had all things in common. They were Jews, or Jewish proselytes, and thought that the gospel belonged to them and their people alone. The apostles were endowed with supernatural gifts for the planting of the Church in its worship, government, instruction and ordinances, and deacons, to the number of seven, were appointed to see to its temporal affairs. For a meeting of the whole they used the court of the temple, but they also met in separate companies, as occasion required, in private houses; and the synagogue, not the temple, furnished the basis of their worship and government. Provision for the poor among them was accepted as a duty, and those who had property contributed freely to the wants of the rest. Enemies encountered them from the beginning—Sadducees, because they preached the resurrection; and Pharisees,

on the ground of disorder. The caution and tolerance recommended by Gamaliel prevailed for a time in the council, but persecution broke out again with great severity upon the death of Stephen, and the members of the Church were scattered abroad.

2. The dispersion was at first through Judea and Samaria. The apostles remained longer in Jerusalem. Philip the evangelist, one of the deacons, ventured to carry the gospel to the Samaritans. From Jerusalem two apostles, Peter and John, were sent to inquire into that work, and, being satisfied with the reality of the conversions by the gift of the Holy Ghost to the converted under their hands, they also preached the gospel in many villages of the Samaritans. Soon afterward Peter's experience in the case of Cornelius, a Roman centurion, prepared him for preaching also to the Gentiles, and a new apostle was miraculously called for that purpose. Paul's conversion occurred in or about the year 37 A. D. After having preached in Damascus, he spent some time in Arabia, visited Jerusalem and returned to his native city, Tarsus.

Meanwhile, some of the dispersed went to Antioch and preached to the Greeks, and a great many believed. Hearing of that, the church which was at Jerusalem sent Barnabas to visit Antioch; and when he had come and had seen the grace of God, he was glad, and, going to Tarsus, brought Paul with him to Antioch, where they both labored for a whole year.

In that great political centre, where strict Jews, with their Hellenistic kinsmen, and heathen, with proselytes to Judaism, lived in close neighborhood, the views of the disciples were further enlightened touching the

liberality of the gospel. In Antioch, accordingly, were the disciples first regarded as other than a Jewish sect, and first received the name "Christian."

The Church—which in the first of these two brief periods was but one community—was in the second dispersed and formed into many. Jewish exclusiveness in the minds of the disciples was so far overcome as to admit of preaching to Samaritans and Gentiles, but all converts were still expected to submit to Jewish rites. The rapid increase of the number of believers deeply impressed the writer of their early history. He recurs to it in various connections. The creed of the Church was contained in the simple precept of the apostle: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved."

It was in the latter years of the emperor Tiberius that the church was formed in Jerusalem; its dispersion began perhaps in the twenty-second year of that reign. The second period lasted through the reign of Caligula and to the fourth year of Claudius. In 41 A. D., Herod Agrippa was elevated by Claudius to be king of all Palestine; he died in 44 A. D. The country was again treated as a province and governed by procurators from Rome.

3. A third section of apostolic history extends from the first regularly-appointed mission to the heathen—about the year 45—until the arrival of Paul at Rome, in 61.

Unbelieving Jews alone were yet systematically opposed to the gospel; Antioch furnished a refuge from their animosity and a suitable centre from which to carry Christian instruction to all classes. A short

time subsequent to the year 44—most likely in 45—a few pious men residing in that city, as they ministered to the Lord and fasted, were directed by the Holy Spirit to set apart Barnabas and Saul to the work of missions among the Gentiles. So, when they had fasted and prayed and laid their hands upon the missionaries, they sent them away. The gospel was carried in every direction, but this, the most important of apostolic missions, was addressed to the heart of the highest civilization and the best-educated people in the world.

The missionaries were well qualified for their task. Both of pure Hebrew blood, they were natives also of Greek countries and had enjoyed both Greek and Hebrew culture; Saul had, beyond a doubt, already preached Christ in the land of his birth. They turned their steps first to Cyprus, the native country of Barnabas, visited the principal cities, Salamis and Paphos, in the latter of which Sergius Paulus, the Roman governor, was converted; the name of the apostle then ceases to be "Saul" and without any reason assigned becomes "Paul." Thence they sailed to the coast of Asia Minor, and, landing at Perga, proceeded through Pamphylia to Antioch in Pisidia, then eastward to Iconium, to Lystra and to Derbe. At Lystra they with difficulty restrained the people from worshiping them as gods, until the Jews stirred up opposition and maltreated Paul almost to murder. From Derbe they returned to Lystra, to Iconium, Antioch, Perga and Atalia, and thence to Antioch in Syria, where they reported to the church what God had wrought by them and abode there a long time with the disciples.

A controversy now arose about what was to be done with Gentile converts—whether it was or was not necessary for them to be circumcised and to keep the law of Moses. As some persons from Judea disturbed the church in Antioch by arguing the affirmative of that question, it was resolved that Paul and Barnabas, with certain others, should go to Jerusalem and consult with the apostles and presbyters there. In Jerusalem the same controversy was going on. Certain Pharisees who had become Christian were very earnest for retaining the law as the foundation of the gospel-structure. In the meeting which took place there was much difference of opinion, but after Paul and Barnabas and Peter had spoken, recounting what God had done for Gentiles through them, James proposed a resolution—which was agreed to—that Gentile converts should abstain from pollutions of idols, from fornication, from things strangled and from blood, and that no other burden should be imposed upon them. Silas and Judas Barsabas were appointed to accompany Paul and Barnabas to Antioch and communicate the message, which they also carried in writing. Still, this was not complete emancipation from legalism. The whole ministry of Paul was needed fully to demonstrate the completeness of the gospel in itself, and that the believer is no longer under the law, but under grace.

The meeting, or council, at Jerusalem occurred in the year 50 or 51—most likely the former. Soon afterward Paul and Barnabas returned to their mission work, but not together. Barnabas took Mark as his companion and went to Cyprus, where he probably

spent the remainder of his days. Paul took Silas and went through Northern Syria around the Gulf of Issus into Cilicia, confirming the churches which himself most likely had planted in his native land, thence to Derbe, Lystra and Iconium—stations on his former tour—and then through Phrygia and Galatia to Mysia. At Troas he had a vision in the night of a man of Macedonia saying, "Come over into Macedonia, and help us." Forthwith he and his companions sailed to Neapolis and went up to Philippi, the chief city of the province. There, after suffering imprisonment, being miraculously delivered, effecting the conversion of the jailer and vindicating their own rights as Roman citizens, the missionaries left their converts organized into a church, and, proceeding westward, visited Thessalonica and Beroëa. Meeting with violent opposition from Jews, Paul went to Athens, where he awaited his companions, then passed on to Corinth, where he continued to preach about eighteen months. At the end of that time he sailed to Ephesus, then to Cæsarea in Palestine, then to Jerusalem to keep the passover, and returned to Antioch in course of the summer.

Paul's third missionary tour began in the autumn of the same year in which he returned from the second. It pursued nearly the same course, but more time was spent in Phrygia and Galatia, and its direction farther west was through Proconsular Asia to Ephesus. In that city Paul remained nearly three years; so that all the people of the province heard the word of the Lord Jesus. In the summer of 57 he proceeded to Macedonia, and in the winter visited Corinth and spent three months there and in the vicinity. Next spring

he set out on his return by way of Macedonia, thence to Troas, and down the Asiatic coast to Miletus, where he had his last interview with the presbyters of Ephesus, then by way of Rhodes and Patara to Tyre, to Ptolemais and Cæsarea, and finally to Jerusalem. At Jerusalem a violent Jewish party charged him with teaching Jews abroad to disregard the laws of Moses and stirred up a mob, from which Paul was rescued by the Roman officer in command of the garrison. This led to his trial before Felix, Festus and Agrippa, and to his appeal to Cæsar. For protection against the violence of the mob at Jerusalem he was kept prisoner in Cæsarea, and at the end of two years ordered to appear in Rome before Nero. In crossing the Ionian Sea he suffered shipwreck, was constrained to spend three months on the island of Malta, and did not reach Rome until the spring of 61. The officer who had charge of Paul and other prisoners on the journey treated him with great courtesy and indulgence. At Rome he was received with similar consideration, allowed to dwell two years in a house hired by himself, without restraint except in the presence of a soldier, and freely to preach the gospel to all who visited him.

Paul's efforts had been addressed chiefly to great centres of population, of government and of moral influence. Antioch was his starting-point, and the scenes of his most prolonged labors elsewhere were Philippi, Ephesus, Corinth and Rome, and perhaps Tarsus in Cilicia. His principal missionary assistants were, in his first journey, Barnabas all the way and Mark as far as Perga; on his second, Silas; and from

Lystra, Timothy and—at least from Troas—Luke; and on his third tour, Luke, Titus and Timothy. Aquila and Priscilla, Apollos and others were also associated with him briefly at different times and places. His Epistles were written chiefly between 52 and 63, at Corinth, at Ephesus, in Macedonia and at Rome.

4. The interval of time between 61 and 70 covers another section of apostolic history, beginning with Paul's imprisonment in Rome and closing in the ruin of Jerusalem.

An ancient tradition represents the apostle to the Gentiles as liberated on his first trial before Nero and as making new missionary tours, revisiting Ephesus, Macedonia and Miletus, and extending his labors to Nicopolis, to Crete and to Spain. In the year preceding the death of Nero (67) it is said that he was again in Rome, having been arrested a second time, and suffered death by beheading in that year. Those who believe in a second imprisonment of the apostle refer to it and to the preceding interval of freedom the writing of the pastoral Epistles.

After the council at Jerusalem obscurity gathers over the history of the other apostles. Peter visited Antioch, where, yielding to the persuasions of stricter Jews, he separated himself from the society of Gentile Christians. The timely reproof of Paul had the effect of correcting him of the error; no trace of it appears in his writings. His undoubtedly genuine Epistle was written from Babylon, a great seat of Jewish learning and population, and it is probable that he had preached among his countrymen of the dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia, to whom the

same Epistle is addressed. As Paul was the chief apostle to the Gentiles, so Peter's vocation was to the dispersed Jews; and that in such capacity he visited Rome in the latter part of the reign of Nero, and suffered martyrdom there about the same time with Paul, is the only tradition touching his relations to Rome which is not incredible. That he was ever bishop of Rome or had ever visited Rome before the date of Paul's last Epistle from that city is a fiction at variance with all the history bearing on the subject.

The apostle John, it is believed, remained many years at Jerusalem in filial care of the mother of his Lord. When Mary died, he removed to Ephesus, and there, in oversight of churches planted by Paul, abode until his death, at a very advanced age, about the end of the century.

Of the other apostles information is still more scanty. They are said to have preached in Arabia, in Æthiopia, in Parthia, in India, in Scythia and other adjoining countries—ancient statements entirely probable, but sustained only by tradition.

The first churches accepted the generic structure of their working system from the hands of the apostles, who were miraculously qualified for the service they performed. On the model of the synagogue, with Christian alterations and additions, were the churches organized, their principal office-holders being presbyters and deacons. All churches, so far as recorded, were constituted on the same model and were of co-ordinate authority. None were vested with supremacy over the rest, although Jerusalem, and then Antioch, were the most influential. Publication of the gospel

was at first made solely by oral address, but a literature was also ordained, and grew up by degrees. The canonical books, except those of John, were all, perhaps, written before the close of this section of time. Fifteen of them—among which are the Gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke—seem to be quoted in the epistle from the Christians in Rome to those in Corinth, written between the years 80 and 100 A. D.

When Paul finished his labors, the freedom and sufficiency of the gospel had been fully vindicated; but a party in the Church still advocated compliance with some parts of the ceremonial law. The great controversy of the apostolic period was over this question. On each side the extremes ran into heresy.

The animosity of unconverted Jews and of the Jewish authorities toward Christians of all parties was very bitter; imperial persecution began incidentally. In the tenth year of the reign of Nero (64) a large part of Rome was burned; the blame was laid on the emperor, and to avert the obloquy from himself he charged it on the Christians. Without concern about their faith, he accepted the common notion that they were a particularly offensive sect of Jews against whom he could turn popular rage without risk to himself. Two years later an insurrection in Judea caused the removal thither of a large body of Roman troops; an obstinate resistance changed the rising into a war. On the part of the Romans it was conducted by Vespasian and his son Titus. Meanwhile, Nero, at Rome, came to his miserable and merited end (68). Vespasian, leaving the army in Judea under command of Titus, returned to the capital. The empire was

waiting his acceptance, and the Flavian family became successor of the Julian. During the reign of Vespasian, Christians, like all other orderly subjects, enjoyed the protection of a government which interfered not with their religious opinions. Titus, after overcoming a resistance of unsurpassed obstinacy, took Jerusalem by storm (September 2, 70). Its walls and houses and—much to the regret of Titus—its beautiful temple were leveled with the ground. The Jews as a nation were completely reduced. Between sixty and seventy years afterward (135), in another rebellion, they were finally broken and scattered to the ends of the earth. Their national centre was lost and their power to injure the Christians greatly reduced, but, dispersed as they were in far-separated societies, their hostility never abated until it became dangerous to themselves to indulge it, and ere that time they had accumulated for their posterity an inheritance of vengeance which is not all exhausted to this day.

The Mosaic economy, virtually abolished in its fulfillment by Christ, was now practically terminated, and in the destruction of the temple the sacrifices and other high ceremonial of its worship ceased.

CHAPTER III.

THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH SEVERED FROM THE JEWISH NATION.

FROM the destruction of Jerusalem (70) to the death of the apostle John (about 100) the churches passed through another stage of progress, apostolic chiefly, and toward the last solely, by the presence of the beloved disciple, unless the tradition be true that Simeon, the son of Clopas, survived to the age of one hundred and twenty years. The church history of this period is very scanty.

The clemency of Vespasian's reign was continued in that of Titus; but when Domitian, the younger brother of Titus, had been on the throne a few years, persecution received imperial sanction. Made to believe that the aim of Christians was to set their Leader at the head of the empire, he had the surviving kinsmen of Jesus brought before him, and, finding them to be poor peasants without political ambition or capacity, dismissed them and ordered the severities to be stopped. Nerva (96) withheld persecution, but took no steps to legalize Christianity. At the end of two years he was followed by Trajan—a wise ruler, but severe—by whom, although persecution was limited, it was within those limits sanctioned.

Under Domitian the apostle John was banished from

Ephesus to the isle of Patmos, where he wrote the book of Revelation. His Gospel was produced after the other three Gospels and while he resided at Ephesus. His Epistles have also the color of the same period of time, adapted rather to fan the love of those brought up as Christians than to instruct converts from heathenism or from Judaism. His teaching did not turn upon legal conformity or the doctrine of faith, but upon Christian love and spiritual union with Christ. It was needful that the gospel should be presented in all three lights—as obedience, as faith and as love. Balanced as they are in the Saviour's teaching, they sustain one another, but the last comprehends the other two. Exposition of the more comprehensive principle was the final work of revelation.

The day on which the Lord arose from the grave was a memorable day to the disciples. One week from that day they were again assembled, when the Lord again appeared among them. Subsequently, mention is made of the first day of the week as that on which the disciples "met together to break bread," and the apostle John speaks of the "Lord's day." Jewish Christians observed the annual festival of Pentecost, soon also adopted by Christians of the West, and in some places exercises of public as well as of private worship were conducted daily. Christian worship consisted of prayer, reading of Scripture, preaching and singing of psalms and hymns and spiritual songs; the music was entirely vocal. Of sacraments they had only two—baptism and the Lord's Supper.

Places of social worship were in the first instance synagogues, but also, and as time went on, most com-

monly, and in the separation from Judaism entirely, private houses. The ordinary ministers in sacred office were presbyters, who were also bishops or pastors, and of whom several belonged to every church. At first they were ordained by the apostles or evangelists, with the concurrence of the church over which they were set and with evidence that they were called by the Holy Spirit. So far as that act was a ceremony, it was by laying on of hands by an apostle or by the Presbytery, or by both. The Presbytery was the Session of presbyters of a church. A certain number of deacons was also necessary in every church to the completeness of the ordinary service.

From the corrupt morals of the age, to which the first Christian converts had been more or less accustomed, the exercise of church discipline was necessarily strict, yet it was ordered by the apostles to be administered with the tenderness of brotherly love. The Christian was to be holy as becoming him in whom dwells the Spirit of God.

PART III.

**THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH UNDER THE
ORDINARY MEANS OF GRACE.**

EMPERORS.		BISHOPS OF ROME.	
	Died A. D.		Died A. D.
Hadrian	138	Anacletus	112
Antoninus Pius	161	Evaristus	121
Marcus Aurelius	180	Alexander	132
Commodus	192	Sixtus	142
Pertinax	193	Telesphorus	154
Didius Julianus	193	Hyginus	158
Septimius Severus	211	Pius	167
Caracalla	217	Anicetus	175
Macrinus	218	Soter	182
Heliogabalus	222	Eleutherius	193
Alexander Severus	235	Victor	203
Maximin	238	Zephyrinus	220
The Gordians, I., II., III.	244	Calixtus	227
Philip	249	Urban	233
Decius	251	Pontian	238
Gallus	253	Anterus	239
Æmilianus	254	Fabian	253
Valerian	259	Cornelius	255
Galienus	268	Lucius	257
		Stephen	260
		Sixtus II.	261

PERIOD FIRST.

(A. D. 100-325.)

CHAPTER I.

APOSTOLIC FATHERS.

WITH the death of the apostle John, about the year 100 A. D., the period of New-Testament revelation closes. For seventy years had the followers of Christ been guided by inspired teachers; they were now to conduct their affairs by the ordinary means of divine appointment. Still, for a time, the personal influence of the apostles lingered in the lives of men who had enjoyed their society. To the existence of this personal influence in the first quarter of the second century a few writings of those apostolic Fathers remain to testify. They consist of an epistle to the church in Corinth from the church in Rome, ascribed to Clement; a general epistle bearing the name of Barnabas; seven epistles ascribed to Ignatius of Antioch; an epistle by Polycarp of Smyrna to the church at Philippi; a book by Hermas called "The Shepherd;" and perhaps the treatise entitled "The Teaching of the Apostles." Other books referred to the same period, or near it, are, with the consent of antiquity, condemned as spurious and grouped under

the head "Apocryphal." To none of these, the genuine works of the apostolic Fathers any more than the apocryphal books, did the early Church attach such a value as to the writings of the apostles.

Clement, a presbyter-bishop in Rome, died in the fourth year of Trajan (102); Ignatius, bishop in Antioch, suffered martyrdom at Rome in 107 or 116, or thereabout; Polycarp, bishop in Smyrna, suffered in 155; and Papias of Hierapolis, near the same time. Of the Barnabas and Hermas of this connection nothing certain is known.

The themes upon which the apostolic Fathers chiefly insisted were the Godhead of Jesus, his equality with the Father, his vicarious suffering, the remission of sins through his blood, the depravity of man, justification by faith in Christ and obedience to his instructions. The great theological question concerned the person of Christ. The extreme doctrines were those of the Docetæ, who denied the reality of his manhood, and of the Ebionites, who argued that he was only a man—a holy man; while the Gnostics wove it, after their fancies, into the speculations of their philosophy.

At first all the presbyters of a church were its bishops (*episcopoi*) or overseers, but on any occasion of public worship or of business one of them necessarily presided. For each to have taken his turn would have best preserved their equality; but from that method they early departed, yielding the duty of presiding permanently to one of their number, who thereby became more especially the overseer or bishop. As this practice prevailed among the churches, it came to be admitted as a rule that there should be only one

bishop in one church where there might be several presbyters. This change took place in one church after another from the beginning of the second century.

Deacons, originally appointed to distribute alms and relieve the apostles of secular duties, took care of the poor and sick, and discharged other offices standing between the Church and the world. From the days of the apostles part of these duties had been assigned in some churches to deaconesses.

Presbyter and deacon were the only ordinary officers of the primitive churches; by division and subdivision of their duties were all other ranks of the clergy created. Knowledge of this fact has never entirely disappeared from among Christian scholars.

Church extension proceeded in apostolic times by the method of planting each new congregation as a separate church with a government entirely competent to itself, after the models constituted everywhere by the apostles; but when the Christian community of a city increased beyond the capacity of any of their houses, it had to be divided into separate congregations. Still, all the Christians of one city were counted as members of one church, with its one college of presbyter-bishops; and when the presiding brother in that college became chief pastor over the city church he was sole bishop over all its congregations. Thus came into force the ruling principle of only one church in a city, though there might be several congregations.

Trajan, on the throne of the empire from 98 to 117, was succeeded by Hadrian, from 117 to 138. Neither evinced any animosity against Christians, but both held that as protectors of the state-religion they were under

obligation to repress a society which taught unbelief in that religion. Christians also suffered much at the hands of local rulers and the populace of certain provinces. Priests and other ministers of heathenism were exceedingly bitter against them, and stirred up the people to maltreat them or caused them to be prosecuted before the magistrates on various false charges. Information touching these matters did not always reach the emperor.

An important testimony from the heathen side is a letter from the younger Pliny to Trajan. Pliny was proconsul of Pontus and Bithynia, where Christianity had made great progress, and found himself called upon to act in regard to those professing its faith where he had no satisfactory law. Having recourse to the emperor, he stated clearly the case and what he had been able to learn about the Christians. In the rescript of Trajan, written probably in 107, we have the first Roman law addressed intelligently to the subject, and yet not intelligently as to Christian doctrine: Pliny had learned very little on that head. It instructed the proconsul not to disturb the Christians, nor to take any action in regard to them unless brought before him on a definite charge; but if so accused and convicted, they were to be punished unless they denied Christ and were willing to adore the gods. Designed, as that rescript was, to put a check upon unjust prosecutions, it assumed Christianity to be a crime, as infidelity to the state-religion and disloyalty to the empire. Many Christians suffered under its sanction.

From Pliny's letter it appears that Christian worship

at the beginning of the second century was extremely simple, and that it was conducted in the Pontic province with a degree of secrecy. Their meetings were held very early in the morning of a certain day, when the act of worship which arrested Pliny's attention was singing a hymn to Christ as God and renewing their obligation to live righteously. After that they separated, and met again for a harmless meal, which they ate without disorder. They were disposed to submit to the government in all things not inconsistent with their religious duties, but could not be induced even by torture and the terrors of death to deny Christ. Pliny was assured that those who made that denial in his presence never had been real Christians. Their number was great in his province. Observances of heathen worship had almost ceased, the temples were nearly deserted, and victims for sacrifice could scarcely find a purchaser.

In the reign of Hadrian the heathen populace in some cities clamored for the exposure of Christians to the wild beasts in the arena as part of the entertainment at the public festivals. Hadrian issued a rescript prohibiting such inhumanity.

After the defeat of the Jewish insurrection under Bar-cochba (A. D. 135) Jews were banished from Palestine, and even forbidden to visit the ruins of Jerusalem, except once a year, upon the anniversary of its destruction. A new town was built by Hadrian amid the ruins and called "*Ælia Capitolina*," and in it arose a church of Gentiles, or of Jews, who, as Christians, were no longer classed with the proscribed race.

CHAPTER II.

PRIMITIVE APOLOGISTS.

WHEN Hadrian, upon his imperial tour, visited Athens, in 126, a written defence of the Christians was addressed to him by the learned bishop Quadratus; another was offered on the same occasion by the philosopher Aristides: both are lost. The earliest work of the kind now extant is that of Justin Martyr, addressed to Antoninus Pius (137-161), in the early part of that monarch's reign, and probably in 139. Another was prepared by the same author at a later date, perhaps to complete the former. He also wrote a dialogue with Trypho, a Jew, in which he encounters the objections from the side of Judaism. Justin was a native of Samaria, born of Gentile parents. His last years were spent in Rome, where he suffered martyrdom under Marcus Aurelius in or about 166. Apologies were written also by Athenagoras of Athens, by Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, and several others, some of them addressed to the emperor, some to the Roman Senate, and some to the heathen public or private persons. They were numerous in the middle and the latter half of the second century. Most of them are no longer extant.

Besides defence against heathenism, it became necessary to maintain the purity of the faith against heretics.

Irenæus between 180 and 188 prepared a treatise against the heresies of the Gnostics, which were then prevailing. The work is extant in an ancient Latin translation, with some portions of the original Greek.

Among the literary opponents whom the apologists had to encounter from the heathen side were the philosophers Celsus and Crescens and the rhetorician M. C. Fronto, who all flourished about the middle of the century. The bitterest of these was Celsus. In a work which he called *The True Account*, he collected all the arguments against Christianity which he could urge with any degree of plausibility; it is now known only through its refutation by Origen.

The arguments against Christianity were chiefly that its Founder was of low birth and suffered an ignominious death, that it was a novelty, that its facts were incredible and its doctrines absurd, and that it demanded an unreasonable faith. Christians were charged with atheism and disloyalty to the state, and sometimes with mysteriously awful crimes.

In debate with Jews the early defenders of the gospel found common ground in the Old-Testament Scriptures, and their aim was to show that the prophecies and types of the Messiah therein contained were fulfilled in Jesus of Nazareth. With heathen the controversy was partly religious and moral and partly political and social, and had to be debated on the ground of admitted moral principles, good sense, demonstrable facts and the common rights of Roman subjects. It was the morality of those early witnesses for the gospel which weighed most in favor of their

cause, and the change which passed upon wicked men when they became Christians.

Imperial persecution had not hitherto been determined by knowledge of Christianity; but when the Stoic philosopher Marcus Aurelius came to the throne (A. D. 161), it assumed new intensity, became general and proceeded upon opposition to Christian doctrine. Educated religiously in one of the best families of the heathen world, it was with solemn concern that this emperor saw the increase of a sect which despised and rejected all that he had learned to regard with the highest veneration and believed to be essential to the well-being, material and religious, of the empire. A philosophy also which seemed to him the wisest and the best the fundamental principles of Christianity denied; that godlessness, untruth and disloyalty, as it seemed to him, he felt in duty bound to restrain. Heathen malignity executed the laws in some quarters with atrocities from which he certainly would have revolted. His successor, the profligate Commodus, took no interest in any religion, and persecution received no encouragement at his hands; but, the laws of Trajan and Aurelius remaining in force, Christians were always exposed to the malignity of the heathen populace.

Apology for Christianity brought out formal statements of Christian doctrine. By Justin especially, though not in a systematic way, the following heads were stated before the middle of the second century: 1. Christians worshiped Christ as God proceeding from the Father; 2. They believed that the Holy Spirit was a person in the Godhead; 3. Of man they

believed that he was created capable of choosing right, but also capable of transgression, and that he fell in Adam by sinning; 4. Justification they assigned entirely to the merits of Christ accepted by faith; 5. They believed in the resurrection of the body of both the righteous and the wicked, the eternal blessedness of the former and eternal punishment of the latter.

Near the end of this century an orderly summary of doctrine—virtually a creed—was presented by Irenæus in his treatise against the Gnostics, corresponding to what was professed incidentally by Clement of Rome, Justin and others of the preceding generation.

Of their worship and ordinances most is to be learned from the apologists, for the works of their theologian Arabianus and of their historian Hegesippus have perished. Baptism, as described by Justin, had taken the place of circumcision, and accordingly might be granted to infants. From Tertullian it appears to have been administered by immersion, by affusion or by sprinkling, in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Only water was used. The day of the week called Sunday, Justin says, was held sacred by them because on that day the Lord Jesus Christ rose from the dead; the people in both town and country observed it by meeting in their respective places of worship. In these meetings the “memoirs of the apostles or writings of the prophets were read to such length as time permitted;” then he who presided delivered a discourse, in which he instructed the people and exhorted them to the imitation of those excellent examples; after that they all rose together and united in prayer made by the presiding minister.

Justin makes no mention of singing, but that element of worship was the one especially mentioned by Pliny. After prayer the people saluted one another with a kiss. Thus closed that service. Then before him who presided were set bread and a cup of wine mixed with water, and he, taking these, offered up prayers and thanksgivings, according to his ability, to the Father of all through the name of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and the people expressed their assent by saying, "Amen!" The prayer being ended, the deacons distributed the elements, giving to each of those present to partake of the bread and of the wine mixed with water, and carrying or sending a portion to those who were absent. In that ordinance only those were allowed to partake who had professed their belief in Christ, had been baptized and were endeavoring to live as Christ commanded. After the service a collection was taken up and deposited with him who presided, for the relief of the sick and poor among the membership.

Besides the Lord's day, many Christians still kept the Jewish sabbath. In the latter half of the second century the annual commemoration of the Lord's death and resurrection had become general in the churches, both East and West; but they differed in the way of observing it, and before the end of the century a serious controversy arose on the subject.

The period which opened with the accession of Nerva (96) and closed with the death of Marcus Aurelius (180) was the most prosperous and tranquil in the history of imperial Rome. Facilities for the publication of the gospel, notwithstanding local and occasional

persecutions, were great and many. The empire had reached its utmost extent, was most of the time at internal peace, the fear or reverence of it was upon all the world, delegates from Antoninus went even so far as China, and the wants, natural and artificial, of so many great cities made demands which the most distant barbarous nations found their profit in supplying.

When, from resting in the counsel of an inspired apostle, the churches came to listen to the opinions of uninspired teachers, many difficulties beset their way. One of these was philosophical speculation of that style which bore the general name of *gnosis*. It was not new, but saw its maturity in the middle of the second century, during the time of the primitive apologists, and included the manifold heresies against which Irenæus addressed his great work.

Christian Gnosticism was a theory of good and evil—how they arose, how they coexist, and how the Persons of the divine Trinity and the work of redemption stand in relation to them.

Some of its sects, having their headquarters in Egypt, taught that God, the Source of all life and good, was eternally inactive—the tranquil reservoir of holiness and power; that matter was also eternal and the residence and source of all evil, and the mixed condition of the present world was effected by spirits emanating from God and connecting themselves with matter in the creation and progress of the earth; Christ and the Holy Spirit are æons of the most powerful emanations, who aid human spirits to extricate themselves from the bondage of matter in which they are involved by creation.

Others, as the Gnostics of Syria, believed in active original powers of good and evil, after the later and corrupted Avestanism of Persia. The Gnostic system of Asia Minor, represented by Marcion, recognized three original principles—the holy, the righteous and the wicked—embodied severally in God, the demiurgus (that is, the world-creator) and the devil. In all Gnostic systems spirit was held to be holy, and evil resident in matter. Men were under the merely righteous being who made the world (the demiurgus), and from him could receive only justice. To free them from his severity and from matter Christ took the appearance of a man among men, and revealed to them the holy God and the way of obtaining his favor.

As a style of philosophy Gnosticism had its maturity in the second century, as a group of heresies it occupied little space beyond the anti-Nicene period; but some of its ingredients took such hold upon the convictions of the Church as to determine some of her dogmas and many of her practices through all the Middle Ages, and have but little relaxed their tenacity to the present day. The relegation of God the Father to an impracticable distance from human life, the belief that sin resides in matter, that maceration of the body purifies the soul, and contempt of all things earthly, are Gnostic remnants thoroughly unchristian and inconsistent with what the Church has otherwise to teach, and yet they continue to assert their place in what is thought to be the holiest Christian sentiment.

About A. D. 170 another heresy, *Montanism*, arose in Phrygia, under the teaching of Montanus, who pro-

fessed to have the dispensation of the Holy Spirit. The Scriptures of the Lawgiver and the Scriptures of the Saviour were now to be completed by the Scriptures of the Paraclete. Montanus and his associates, Maximilla and Priscilla, claimed that by an extreme asceticism they had become holy, divinely inspired and empowered with the gift of prophecy. Their prophecies, committed to writing, were esteemed by their followers as the crowning work of revelation. Driven from Asia Minor by persecution, the Montanists found refuge in Northern Africa and their ablest advocate in Tertullian.

In resisting Montanism another party rushed to an opposite extreme, and not only denied the continuance of the miraculous gifts of the Spirit, but also the doctrine of the divine Logos, and rejected the Gospel according to John, in which principally it is taught, and also the book of Revelation, because of the chiliasm which was then defended by it. *The Alogi*, as they were called, from two Greek words signifying "the rejection of the Logos," seem to have accepted Christ as a mere man or as deified only by an inspiration from the Father.

The second century, from the end of its first quarter onward, was fertile in heresies. Without a systematic statement of theology to sustain and restrain, and with a terminology general and undefined, some men ran wild in speculation. Early Christians, uninspired, had no more certainty of being always in the right than Christians of later days, and from lack of experience were more likely to make mistakes; and yet touching the essential doctrines of the gospel the great body of

the Church was entirely of one mind. Although they had their honored traditions and some books were in use among them which are no longer extant, the Scripture books as they have come down to us were the standard of their faith. They were regularly read in public worship and frequently quoted in Christian writings.

The Greek originals of the New Testament were in use in both the East and the West, and also the Septuagint, or Egyptian-Greek version of the Old Testament. But translations for instruction of the unlearned were made at an early date—into Syriac for the East, and into Latin for the West, as early as the second century.

External uniformity was not enforced over the churches by any central authority nor by any all-comprehending general government. Co-ordinate churches held more or less intercourse by letter and by transfer of members from one to another, and in cases of common danger churches of the same province held councils, or conferences, together. All the churches treated each other as members of one great fraternity, and all adhered to the same general system of polity and worship. All claimed the right of interfering, with remonstrance and reproof, where any one had fallen into disorder or departed from the common standard.

CHAPTER III.

CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS.

FROM the beginning of the persecution under Septimius Severus (202) until the legalizing of Christianity by Gallienus (261) was a time distinguished by Christian erudition and biblical criticism. In the Christian churches, from the beginning, it was customary to provide instruction for children and converts from heathenism. The method employed was chiefly oral, and the Greek word signifying that method (*κατηχεῖν catechein*) furnished the words most commonly used in relation to it. The work was *catechesis*, the means employed *catechismus*, the person who taught was a *catechist*, and the pupils were *catechumens*. A more advanced course was needed for those who were to be ministers of the gospel. Athenagoras is mentioned as a teacher in that high course at Alexandria in the second century. But it was when Pantænus and his pupil Clement were united in the management of its instructions that the Alexandrian school rose to a reputation above all rivalry. It was distinguished from the *Mouseion* (museum)—that is, the polytheistic university founded by the Ptolemies, and which was still in operation—by the name *Didaskaleion*. There biblical interpretation and Christian theology were first subjected to scientific treatment, in the exigences of

catechetical instruction and of apologetics, in defence against Jews, heretics and heathens; for Alexandria was also a seat of Jewish learning, and from it issued the most elaborate and ingeniously constructed Gnosticism.

The school built up by Pantænus and Clement was carried to its highest reputation by the uncommon intellectual endowments and laborious industry of Origen, followed successively by Heraclas and Dionysius until 248. Nor was its reputation seriously impaired until after the Council of Chalcedon (451). Its most illustrious scholars were those of the third century, at whose head stood Clement and Origen. Some of their voluminous writings remain. Clement is still represented by his *Address to the Heathen*, his *Instructor*, which treats of Christ as a teacher, and his *Stromata*, or miscellanies, full of valuable antiquarian information, and Origen by his works in biblical scholarship and theology. Origen, the author of the earliest extant work on systematic theology, in his views of doctrine guided the thinking of a large number of the ministry for many generations, and some of the most bitterly debated heresies had their roots in his teaching.

Meanwhile, the Syrian school, with its seat at Antioch, was rising toward that eminence which it reached one hundred years later. Among the Christian scholars of Syria in the days of Origen was Julius Africanus, a native of Emmaus in Palestine, whose chief work was a chronicle from the Creation to a date within his own lifetime (221). It is no longer extant as a whole, but copious fragments of it

preserved by Eusebius and others are still highly estimated by chronologers. Some smaller works, as his letter to Origen on the story of Susanna, evince an historico-critical ability above the level of his time.

Upon the death of Commodus the empire entered upon its long and fluctuating decline. Regard for Julius Cæsar conferred his accumulated honors upon his legal heir, and as long as adoption continued the succession imperial office was hereditary in his family. In the death of Nero that succession came to an end, and the power of appointment was grasped by the army. Restricted by the accession of the Flavian family, the irregularity was restrained for a longer time by the method of Nerva, whereby the emperor on the throne adopted an already approved successor. By that means a steady rule was secured until the death of Commodus. Then, all check upon election by the army being removed, the empire became a precarious military depotism. Pertinax was raised to the throne, but retained it only three months. Didius Julianus purchased it by a large bounty to the Pretorian guard, but lost it, together with his life, after a reign of two months. Military force sustained other candidates, among whom Septimius Severus with the army of Illyricum proved successful. In the first years of his reign Christians suffered only from the animosity of the heathen populace and of some of the provincial governors. The law of Trajan was still in force, whether the reigning emperor ordered it or not. As protector of the state religion he could not passively see multitudes deserting it to increase the strength of a foreign faith; yet it was not until the tenth year of

his reign (202) that Septimius Severus issued a law forbidding any more heathens to become Jews or Christians. It was then that Clement and Pantænus withdrew for a time from their work in Alexandria, that Leonidas, the father of Origen, was brought to the block, and many others sealed their testimony with their blood. Yet the law was slackly obeyed in some provinces, and in others not at all. After a campaign of great personal exposure in Britain, Severus died at York in 211. His son Caracalla succeeded him by favor of the soldiers, and the state began to experience the effects of waning power. The new emperor impoverished his subjects to pamper his army and purchase the privilege of peace from his enemies. Having made himself odious at Rome, he extended Roman citizenship to all free men of his dominion and withdrew from the city. He was put to death by instigation of Macrinus, prefect of the Pretorian guard (217), who took his place. Within a year Macrinus was slain by the soldiers, and Elagabalus, a boy of fourteen years of age, set up on the plea of being a son of Caracalla. Before the end of four years the boy-emperor, precocious in profligacy, met the fate he had ordered for many others. With Caracalla religion was a matter of little concern. No action was taken by him to stay persecution or promote it. Provincial governors were left to enforce the laws or not, as they chose. Elagabalus, himself an adherent of a dissenting ceremonial—the sun-worship of Syria—showed favor to Christians, as to all dissentients. When, in 222, Alexander Severus succeeded to the throne, conspicuous favor was shown to Christians even in the imperial

palace. His mother, Julia Mammæa, was so friendly to them that many believed her one of their number. His domestic chapel, with busts representing the Roman gods, contained others for Abraham, Christ, Orpheus and Apollonius of Tyana, and the Golden Rule of Christ was inscribed upon his palace.

In the fourth year of Alexander's reign Persian nationality was revived under Ardishir Babegan, who overthrew the Parthians and prepared to drive the Romans from Asia. The Avestan religion was restored, and Christians were driven back into the empire or subjected to a severe oppression in Persia. The Sassanide princes recognized no such affinity between their degenerate Avestanism and the gospel of Christ as their hero, Cyrus, recognized between the Avestan monotheism of his day and the religion of the Jews.

Alexander successfully resisted the first Persian invasion, and had turned his victorious arms against enemies in the North, when he was murdered. He had reigned thirteen years. Maximin, a Thracian, was elevated by the army. The hatred of the new ruler to the Christians was shown by indulging the heathen populace in their cruelties to them and directing his own attack against their clergy. At the end of about three years (238) he also was slain by the soldiers. In this case the Senate disputed the right of the army of the North to appoint a master for them, and favored the election of Gordian, proconsul of Africa, and when he and his sons both lost their lives transferred that preference to his grandson, although he was at the time a boy of not more than

fifteen years. At the end of six years the younger Gordian was murdered through the machinations of Philip the Arabian, who assumed the purple in his stead.

Under Gordian the churches were not molested, and Philip was even friendly. In 249 he was defeated in battle with Decius, and slain. Decius marked his accession by issuing an order to all governors of provinces to constrain the people to return to the established religion of the state by force of the severest penalties, thereby instituting the most sanguinary persecution that the churches had ever to endure. It proved, also, the occasion of much subsequent controversy touching the discipline of those Christians who had succumbed to suffering or fear.

Decius, slain in battle with the Goths in 251, was followed by Gallus, who renewed the persecution after a brief relaxation. But in less than a year and a half, Gallus was slain by his soldiers. His successor, Emilianus, met the same fate in three months. Valerian was raised to power, and held it until 260, when he was defeated and taken prisoner by the Persians. Persecution, restrained in his first four years, was revived in 257. By Gallienus, who succeeded his father, it was brought to an end in 261 *by the recognition of Christianity as a lawful religion*. Thenceforward until the latter years of Diocletian, Christians suffered little or no molestation from imperial interference.

Christians were still the minority of the population, upon the whole, but in some provinces they were more numerous than the heathen. By the middle of the third century their doctrines had become generally

known. No longer could they be treated with contempt; no longer could the charge of disloyalty be plausibly made against them, but that of atheism, as the heathen meant it, was fully established. Their cause was distinctly understood to be death to the worship of the gods of Rome, and even to belief in their existence.

Christian influence had now been operating so long that it had wrought an important change upon the character of society in general. Vices once so common as to be little blamed were now branded with disgrace, and some once practiced in heathen temples, and esteemed proper, if not essential, parts of worship, had come to be regarded as corruptions from which polytheism had purified itself by returning to its own standards. That Christianity had some good in it was no longer denied, but it was urged that polytheism had more, and that it maintained a reverence for the gods and a ritual worship indispensable to the completeness of the service men owed them. It was still argued that the virtues of Christians were disfigured by a low and tasteless manner of life, a barbarous form of worship and a fanatical spirit, and that by their atheism they were bringing down the wrath of the gods upon the empire.

The attitude of the most intelligent heathen toward Christianity and their old religion was not unlike that of many educated men in India at the present time. By these the *Neo-Platonic philosophy* was accepted as their guide. Ammonius Saccas, the founder of that philosophy, died in 243, at the age of more than eighty years. His system was one in which some elements

of Christianity and of Oriental theosophy were engrafted upon the stock of Platonism.

The heathen had also their wonder-working sage in the Pythagorean philosopher Apollonius of Tyana, who lived at the same time with Christ. A book professing to give an account of him was written about the year 220 by Philostratus at the instance of Julia Domna, the wife of Septimius Severus. It represented Apollonius as a learned ascetic traveling in various countries between Greece and India, teaching and working miracles and disputing on topics of religion under divine authority.

In theological controversy the principal question agitated was in what way Christ is God, and the turn which it took was determined by the opinions of those who taught the singleness of person in Godhead, called by the general name *Monarchian*. Some believed that Jesus was only a man, but conceived by miraculous means and endowed with divine wisdom from his birth, and that the power of God was conferred upon him in greater degree than upon the prophets or any other human being. First taught in Rome by Theodotus, who came from Byzantium in the latter part of the second century, this humanitarian doctrine received further impulse from the teaching of Artemon in Rome about the same time. Rejected by Christians in general, it continued to be defended by a party through the first half of the third century. A second variety of Monarchianism was that which claimed all deity for Christ. Jesus was divine by the indwelling of the only person in Godhead—a doctrine first preached in Rome by Praxeas, who came from

Asia Minor about the end of the reign of Commodus. For holding a similar opinion Noëtus was excommunicated at Smyrna in 230. This class of heretics were also called Patripassian, according to a saying of Tertullian about Praxeas—that “two works of the Devil he wrought in Rome: he drove out prophecy and brought in heresy, put the Holy Spirit to flight and crucified the Father.”

Of kindred nature were the views of Sabellius, a presbyter in Ptolemais between 250 and 260, who taught that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit were not different persons, but different manifestations of one person. We conceive of God in his self-existent, creative and all-supporting power as the Father; in his illuminating power in the souls of sinners, as the Son; and in his enlivening power to their regeneration, as the Holy Spirit; and thus we have three divine energies in one person.

Controversy arose, also, out of the speculations of the Alexandrian school, especially from those of Origen. His method of interpreting Scripture recognized a threefold meaning in it—namely, the literal or historical, the moral and the mystical. In urging the mystical meaning Origen was charged with sometimes denying the historical and thereby perverting the true meaning of Scripture. This method, if it had some learned advocates, also encountered strong opposition. Origen, in his theology, moreover, gave occasion to much controversy. His views were presented in commentaries on Scripture and in separate treatises, as well as in his work on systematic theology called *περὶ ἀρχῶν* (*De Principiis*). They were determined more

or less by opposition to the Gnostics, as will appear from the following heads:

1. God is an unembodied spirit,¹ everlasting and active, creating from and to all eternity.²

2. All rational created beings were originally equal and clothed in bodies. The differences among them are due to the various uses of their freedom.³

3. In a previously-existing world those differences arose; and when God made this world, he put his fallen rational creatures into bodies adapted to their fallen nature. But, retaining their freedom, it is open to all—even to the devil and his angels—to attain perfect reformation.⁴

4. The Son of God, distinguished from the man Jesus, was not created, but as wisdom proceeding forth from God, as a constant ray of the divine glory, was generated by the will of God from all eternity.⁵

5. The Holy Spirit is a person in Godhead in perfect unity with the Father and the Son.⁶

6. In Jesus the divine Logos united himself to a real body and human soul, both specially prepared for him.⁷

7. The Holy Spirit impresses divine truth upon men to their salvation.

8. The world had a beginning, and will have an end. That end will be the triumph of the work of Christ. As there were worlds before this, so there will be worlds after it.

9. There will be a resurrection of both righteous and wicked, followed by rewards and punishments

¹*De Prin.*, i. c. i. 6. 4.

²i. 6. 4. iii. 5. 3.

³ii. ix. 6.

⁴i. 6. 3. ⁵i. ch. 2.

⁶i. ch. iii.

⁷ii. ch. vi.

according to a final judgment. But the resurrection body of the righteous will be a spiritual body.

Origen also conceives of a more distant future, when the end shall have been "restored to the beginning," and the "condition of things will be re-established in which rational nature was placed, and it will have no need to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil; so when all feeling of wickedness has been removed and the individual has been purified and cleansed, when death shall no longer anywhere exist, nor the sting of death, nor any evil at all, then verily God will be all in all." He defends the divine inspiration of Scripture, both Old Testament and New.

It was commonly believed that after the resurrection there would be an earthly kingdom of Christ in which for a thousand years the saints would enjoy much happiness. That was to be the great Sabbath of the world's history, and was to occur, as some thought, after the lapse of six thousand years from the Creation. A literal acceptance of the millennium described in the book of Revelation was insisted on by Nepos and Coracion, Egyptian bishops. Their teaching on that point was so effectually opposed by Dionysius of Alexandria before a synod held at Arsinoë in 255 that Coracion professed himself convinced of his error, and renounced it.

More frequent mention now occurs of places exclusively used for Christian worship. Alexander Severus assigned a piece of land in Rome for that purpose, and the edict of Gallienus ordered their places of worship to be restored to the Christians. Such an edifice was called "a place of prayer," or "the Lord's

house," or "the house of meeting," or simply "the meeting" (*ecclesia*).

From the middle of the second century holy days had increased in number. In some places the churches fasted and held meetings on Wednesdays and Fridays, the days of the Lord's betrayal and crucifixion. The Easter observance assumed greater proportions, its chief points being the Crucifixion, the Resurrection and the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost. The first was commemorated by fasting; the second and third, by festivals; and the interval between them, as the Sabbath of the Christian year.

Frequently-recurring persecution had constrained Christians in many quarters to keep their places and times of worship secret, and secrecy began to be regarded as an essential element in some parts of their service, which came to be spoken of as mysteries. During the celebration of the Lord's Supper it was thought proper that all unbaptized persons should be excluded. In some quarters the distinction began to be made between esoteric and exoteric doctrines—between the written word and secret tradition. At Rome, Naples, Syracuse and some other places Christians found refuge in caverns beneath the ground, where they conducted their worship and buried their dead. Long after a hiding-place had ceased to be needed the crypt remained a solemn part of a church-edifice.

Inordinate importance was now attached to martyrdom. The baptism of blood secured acquittal of all sins, and intercession of martyrs was thought to be of avail in heaven. For that honor many obtruded

their profession upon unwilling agents of persecution. That fanaticism, though censured by sober-minded people and provincial councils, continued to prevail, and wrought evil in the Church, long after its occasion had ceased.

Exorcism of evil spirits from men under their possession, practiced at an earlier date only by persons deemed of eminent holiness, became now the office of a special order of clergy and a regular preliminary to baptism. Certain ceremonies and prayers were prescribed for the purpose of casting out the evil spirits who were supposed to hold all unbaptized persons under their power.

CHAPTER IV.

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE IN LATIN.

IN the last years of the second century we meet with the first productions of a Christian literature in the Latin language; they belong to Northern Africa, and are the earlier works of Tertullian. The history of the North-African Church, already a large and flourishing community, also begins with that illustrious Latin Father.

Tertullian appears first as an apologist about 190. He was a native of Carthage, son of a proconsular centurion, became a presbyter in the church of his native city, and wrote a great number of works in the Christian cause, chiefly in the reigns of Severus and Caracalla. After reaching middle life he embraced the doctrines of Montanus, of which he stands the most gifted advocate.

About the same time, Minutius Felix, a Roman lawyer, wrote an apologetic work in the form of a dialogue, which he called *Octavius*; Caius, a presbyter at Rome, wrote a treatise against Montanism; while Novatian, also a presbyter in the same church, defended that sect and introduced it into the West of Europe.

In the middle of the third century the most eminent leader of ecclesiastical opinion was Cyprian, a native

of Africa, until middle life a heathen, but well educated and successful in his profession of rhetoric. Possessed of considerable property, upon his conversion, in 246, he sold it all and distributed the proceeds among the poor. Next year he was ordained presbyter in Carthage, and in 248 elected bishop. In the persecution under Decius he was marked out for a victim, but succeeded in eluding arrest. Six years later, under Valerian, he was singled out with such purpose that escape, if practicable, was not within what he deemed the bounds of duty to his people. In 258 he suffered death for the profession of his faith. Much of Cyprian's attention was constrained to church government and discipline, and to those subjects do most of his writings pertain.

In the terrible Decian persecution many Christians denied their faith to save their lives. Even some who had boastfully urged their profession upon the officers of government shrunk back in the face of suffering. It sometimes cost but little effort to escape. The aim of the ruler, for the most part, was to suppress Christianity, not unnecessarily to waste human life. The act of submission was made very light. To partake in a sacrifice, to however small an extent, to drop a grain of incense on an altar or to present a certificate of not being a Christian was sometimes accepted quietly without the public proclamation of renouncing Christ. But all who submitted to any such evasions were, equally with the blatant apostate, put out of communion with the church; yet a distinction was made in the degrees of guilt. When the storm passed over, many who had thus fallen away—"lapsed," as it was called

—made application to be restored. It became a matter of no little difficulty to settle the terms upon which they were to be readmitted or rejected. The schism of Felicissimus in Carthage, and that of Novatianus in Rome—both primarily opposition to their respective bishops—were complicated with the question of the lapsed, the former advocating lenity in readmitting and the latter absolutely excluding them. Councils in both cities, by taking sober middle ground, extracted the virus from both extremes.

Ministerial equality was still a matter of controversy, but had now to be debated on a different level from that of Ignatius or his interpolater. It was no longer a distinction between the rank of presbyter and that of bishop which was to be asserted or denied, but a distinction pretended to among bishops themselves. It appeared as early as 196 in the attempt of the bishop of Rome to constrain the Oriental churches to the observance of Easter after the Western manner, but had been set aside as unjustifiable. In the middle of the third century the attempt to exercise superiority was revived. Two Spanish bishops who had lapsed by accepting certificates in the persecution were deposed by a synod of their own countrymen. They applied to Stephen, bishop of Rome, for his influence in their favor. Stephen assumed to restore them, but their places had been filled. The Spanish bishop wrote to those of Africa, who in a letter drawn up by Cyprian agreed to set aside the action of Stephen as being an unjustifiable participation under a mistake in the disorderly conduct of the deposed.

Validity of baptism by heretics was denied in the

churches of Africa, Egypt, Syria and Asia Minor on the ground, as defended by Cyprian, that to the orthodox Church alone is committed the charge of salvation, and through her regularly ordained and godly clergy alone can sacramental grace be given. Accordingly, they baptized converts from heretical churches as if coming to them from the world. In Rome such persons were admitted by the ordinary steps of probation without rebaptism. The efficacy of the sacrament was held to be due to its institution by Christ in form, and not to any merit in him that administers it or in the Church to which he belongs. Two councils in Carthage (255, 256) having taken action to confirm their own practice, Stephen of Rome condemned their doctrine in severe language and assumed to excommunicate them. They refused to acknowledge the legitimacy of his procedure, and in that were sustained by Firmilian, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, expressing the sentiment of the clergy in that province, and by Dionysius of Alexandria. The controversy terminated with the martyrdom of both its leaders, Stephen and Cyprian. At the Council of Arles it was resolved that if one comes to the Church from heresy, if he has been baptized in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, only the hand of the bishop is to be laid upon him, that he may receive the Holy Spirit; but if not in the name of the Trinity, then he should be baptized. This afterward became the common practice.

In the course of this controversy Cyprian rejected the *pretension of the bishop of Rome to superiority of rank and authority*, and defended the equal rank of all

bishops and the full authority of each in his own charge. Before the council of Carthage in 256 he took occasion to state fully the doctrine which he and the other members of that body held touching the equality of bishops. On that head he coincided with the majority of ecclesiastics in his day, but in defending it he constructed by his doctrine of church union the foundation for the very evil he was controverting. In his own day the bishops of Rome, of Antioch and of Alexandria, without any superiority of rank, by the mere magnitude and importance of their cities, wielded an influence greatly superior to that of ordinary bishops. The greater number of the bishops whose equality was defended by Cyprian were pastors of only single congregations. In his view the essentials of church unity consisted in a particular organization and connection with bishops in the line of apostolic appointment. On that foundation the principle that all the Christians of one city should form but one church after the adoption of the rule of but one bishop in a church inevitably produced the diocesan system; for when the church of a city increased in numbers and had to divide into several congregations, the one bishop was constrained to employ presbyter-assistants to conduct worship at the different places of meeting. These presbyters were under his direction, the sub-pastors of the respective charges over which they were set. The bishop of such a city church became chief over a number of pastors, who in rank were only presbyters; while the bishops in small towns and country places, where there had been no such increase of numbers, remained

bishops over only their single respective congregations. It was natural that he who presided over the pastors of several congregations should assume superiority over him who had pastoral charge of only one. Such is the juncture at the middle of the third century, when the bishop of Rome, who claims a place of conspicuous eminence among bishops, has yet no episcopal jurisdiction over bishops, nor rank superior to others. It was a state of things which could not continue. No argument, however strong, for equality of bishops in circumstances so different could withstand the tendency to further separation of ranks.

The same period is marked by the increasing frequency and regularity of *provincial councils*. In the first instance they held in check the pretensions of the bishops in great cities, but their practical working soon demonstrated the opposite tendency; for, consistently with the municipal element which was fundamental in the ancient idea of government, the presidency of a council was conceded to the bishop of the chief city of the province in which it was held.

Baptism was now burdened with ceremonies giving it the character of initiation to mysteries. The candidate was first exorcised, to drive away evil spirits from him. After application of the water, the kiss of peace was given him, and a mixture of milk and honey was administered. He was then anointed and marked on the forehead with the sign of the cross, after which the minister laid his hands upon him and bestowed the benediction.

Though not universal, baptism of children was the common practice in Christian families. Some, holding

that heinous sin after baptism could not be pardoned, opposed infant baptism, and even in the case of adults encouraged the deferring of it until late in life or the threatened approach of death. Sponsors were also introduced in some churches in the time of Tertullian, who opposed the practice as another objectionable consequence of infant baptism.

In the Lord's Supper, we read from Justin, wine mingled with water was used. It was the common way of using wine at table, but in the third century superstition recognized a mystery in that mixture. The water represented the people; the wine, the blood of Christ; and their mingling, the union of Christ with the multitude of the faithful. The notion of a sacrificial efficacy in the elements had begun to be entertained by some as early as the time of Tertullian. In some places the sacrament was observed daily, in the belief that it was the spiritual food of the soul to which the fourth petition of the Lord's Prayer referred, and which imparted to the material frame of the believer the germ of immortality.

In earlier times the preparation of catechumens was merely their instruction and that treatment which elicited evidences of their piety, but by and by it began to assume the color of austerities productive of purification. The readmission of those excommunicated for great sins was thought to require a discipline still more severe, and the numerous cases of the lapsed about the middle of the third century seemed to render that course necessary to the purity of the Church. Thus was the practice of *penance* fully inaugurated before the death of Cyprian. Even those who dissented from it con-

tributed to define it. The Novatians would readmit none who had been guilty of great sin after baptism, and had therefore to distinguish between sins deadly and sins venial. In large churches it was thought expedient to appoint a presbyter to examine penitents and hear from them what they were willing to confess, and to announce to each the penance demanded of him by the existing regulations.

Little did these early Christians apprehend that in this practice was the seed which should grow into the enormities of the confessional.

CHAPTER V.

CONTEMPORARY CHRONOLOGY.

EMPERORS.		BISHOPS OF ROME.	
	Died A. D.		Died A. D.
Claudius II.	270	Dionysius	272
Aurelian	275	Felix	275
M. C. Tacitus	276	Eutychian	283
Probus	282	Caius	296
Carus	283	Marcellinus	304
Numerianus	284	Marcellus	309
		Eusebius	311
		Melchiades	314
		Sylvester	337

DIOCLETIAN ORDER OF EMPERORS.

Diocletian's reign begins	284
Division of empire	286

<i>Eastern Augustus.</i>		<i>Western Augustus.</i>
Diocletian.		Maximian.
	<i>Cæsars.</i>	
Galerius.		Constantius.
	305.	
	<i>Augusti.</i>	
Galerius.		Constantius.
	<i>Cæsars.</i>	
Maximin Daza.		Severus.
	311.	
	<i>Augusti.</i>	
Maximin Daza.		Constantine.
Cæsar, with the title of Augustus, Licinius.		
	314.	
	<i>Augusti.</i>	
Licinius.		Constantine.
	324.	
Sole Augustus.	Constantine (died 337).	

CHAPTER V.

GROWTH OF THE HIERARCHY.

(261-325 A. D.)

FROM the legalizing of Christianity in 261 a new stage of Church history began, and continued until 324, when Constantine, carried to the throne by Christian arms, commenced the reconstruction of the empire—not as a dominion of annexed provinces, but as one organic whole, into which he received and adopted Christianity as the state religion, and in 325 called its first General Council.

During that period of sixty-four years the Church enjoyed more than forty years of uninterrupted peace and developed the diocesan system. Bishops claiming equality among themselves held superiority over the other clergy, while those of the large cities gradually established their superior rank over other bishops, thereby laying the firm foundations of metropolitanism.

Imperial office remained in the gift of the army until the accession of Diocletian, in 284. The interval exhibited the empire in almost a state of anarchy. Division was as active in the State as was organization in the Church. The accession of Diocletian constitutes an era in the history of both. In the Church it long continued to be used as such, under the name of “the

era of Diocletian " or of the martyrs. That illustrious ruler devised a plan to regulate and control the imperial succession, and to secure efficient government in every part of his dominions.

1. In 286 he chose Maximian, one of his generals, as a colleague, assigning to him the government of the West, the seat of which was Rome. The two were to be equal in power; both were to have the title "Augustus" and to co-operate in all affairs of the whole empire.

2. Soon afterward they chose assistants, who were to be emperors of a second rank, called "Cæsars." Diocletian chose Maximin Galerius, to whom was assigned Thrace and Illyricum, all the rest of the East being retained under his own immediate rule. Maximian chose Constantius Chlorus and gave him authority over Spain, Gaul and Britain.

3. The cæsars were to be lieutenants of the augusti; and when an augustus died or resigned, his cæsar was to take his place and select another cæsar. It was hoped that thus the empire would always have rulers present in its four great quarters, always have men in its two highest places in the ripeness of experience to guide—or, at least, to counsel with—younger men of impulse and energy, and that there would be a regular and reliable order of succession.

4. It seems to have been a part of the plan that unless death should work the change sooner the augusti, after the lapse of a certain time or the attainment of a certain age, should abdicate and leave the supreme authority to their cæsars. If so, it was not whim or mere weakness which at the end of twenty-

one years, in 305, led Diocletian to abdicate and go into retirement. His colleague augustus, Maximian, did likewise. Their cæsars became augusti, and new cæsars were appointed. Galerius was now augustus of the East and Constantius of the West, while the cæsar of the East was Maximin Daza; of the West, Severus.

Constantius died at York in 306, whereupon the soldiers arrogated to themselves the power so long kept out of their hands. The army of Britain insisted upon making Constantine, the son of Constantius, augustus, and the prince accepted their nomination without regard to Diocletian's scheme. Other pretenders arose elsewhere. Galerius maintained the scheme in the East, and Maximian returned to defend it in the West. The question was decided by the sword. Severus was defeated and slain, and Constantine marched in victory from Britain to Rome. In the neighborhood of the city he fought the decisive battle of Saxa Rubra in 312. It was in that campaign that he saw, as he thought, the luminous cross with its *Hoc signo vinces* which he afterward placed on his banner.

Galerius died in 311, and Maximin Daza succeeded to the place of augustus in the East, with Licinius as cæsar with the honorary title augustus. Constantine in the next year became sole emperor of the West.

From the time of Gallienus, Christians had not suffered from imperial persecution until the nineteenth year of Diocletian, when, persuaded, it is said, by the urgency of his cæsar, the senior emperor gave his sanction to a new attempt at suppressing their worship. He soon after abdicated, but the persecu-

tion was continued by his successor. Galerius just before his death, in 311, revoked the edict. It was afterward put in force by Maximin Daza, who succeeded to the throne in the same year, but could now take effect only in the East. In the West, from its beginning under Maximian, the persecution was light, and lasted not quite two years. With the feelings of Constantius it was entirely at variance.

No sooner had Constantine secured himself in command of the West than he issued, in conjunction with Licinius, whose jurisdiction covered the European East, an edict proclaiming toleration for all religions. Another edict especially in favor of Christians was issued from Milan in 313.

During the absence of Licinius in Italy, Maximin Daza invaded his territory. Licinius hastily returned, and inflicted upon him a ruinous defeat. He fled to Tarsus, where he died the same year, 314.

Licinius now, as master of all the Eastern empire, assumed the attitude of competitor with Constantine for the dominion of the whole. He was worsted in the war waged in that cause, in 315, and constrained to cede the European East, except Thrace, to Constantine.

Eight years later Licinius concluded to try the fortune of war at the head of the heathen interest. The conflict which ensued was a trial of military strength between the heathen and the Christian parties in the empire. The two armies met near Adrianople in 323. Constantine displayed the banner of the cross; Licinius raised the old idolatrous standards of Rome. The issue of that hard-fought battle—one of the most

momentous in the world's history—was the overthrow of Licinius and of the cause which he had espoused. Another, but a feeble, attempt completed his ruin. To heathenism the defeat was final. The whole empire in 324 came under the rule of the Christian leader, who immediately issued circular letters exhorting all his subjects to accept the gospel.

The next step for religion was to recognize the churches as in their organization holding relations to the new constitution of the civil government.

Ecclesiastical tradition, reckoning from the first under Nero, counts ten heathen persecutions—namely, under Nero, Domitian, Trajan, Marcus Aurelius, Septimius Severus, Maximin, Decius, Valerian, Aurelian and Diocletian. But that number is arbitrary, and the imperial names given are not the same on all lists. With equal justice they may be said to be more or fewer according as attention is confined to general persecutions or extended to comprehend the local—to those which were ordered by an emperor or including those which he failed to repress. Imperial general persecutions were few; local persecutions were of frequent occurrence.

We have already seen that the apostolic Church was a society of men each of whom was expected to occupy his gifts for the spiritual profit of the whole, and whose government and ordinances were administered by presbyter-bishops and deacons. To meet the demands of increasing membership and multiplying churches, development of those primitive elements was indispensable. Four different paths lay open.

First. Each separate church might have adhered to its own sufficient inner government, keeping the gifted of the congregation in their place by representation and holding the relations of Christian fraternity to other churches.

Secondly. They might have retained the same inner identity and grown into a confederation of churches mutually respecting one another's feelings and interests and aiding one another with recognition of fellowship and counsel.

Thirdly. To all the churches thus internally constituted an organic union might have extended a development of the inner ministry by presbyters, deacons and representatives of the gifted members of the congregation, with legal authority over all. This would have been a true, fitly-regulated development of New-Testament instruction.

Fourthly. The way was open to follow the unfolding of the power delegated to the presiding presbyter-bishop by extending it to a monarchy over the church of which he was pastor, and subsequently over the churches in the inferior places of the province. In that case the history of the church would be the succession of her presiding ministry, without any representation of laymen.

The method actually pursued was the last.

Episcopal equality, as defended by Cyprian, was suffering infringement even in his day. In the succeeding generation a new and higher rank among bishops boldly claimed and received general recognition. Under the method of church extension then pursued it was not easy to withhold an unequal weight of influence

from the bishops of the large cities. From the principles of one church in one city and only one bishop in one church proceeded several effects at variance with episcopal parity. *First.* One bishop presiding over several pastors of city congregations who were not installed, but only presbyters acting in the capacity of pastors as they were sent, was actually in a different official place from a bishop having charge of only one congregation. *Secondly.* A mission from a great city church to a neighboring town was at first a mere mission station, but when fully constituted a church and a pastor ordained for it, that pastor was the bishop of that town; and when it came to have more than one congregation, he became a diocesan. But that he should still be esteemed as in some degree of inferior honor to the bishop of the mother-church was an almost inevitable result of the then prevailing ideas. *Thirdly.* Strength and support were expected by the churches in the smaller towns and villages from such connection with great cities; in course of time many of them, originally independent, applied for and were accepted into such filial relations to the great city church of the province. Thus, before the end of the third century the jurisdiction of some of the great city bishops extended very far. That of Rome included not only her proper missions, but those of the greater part of Central and all the South of Italy, and perhaps the adjoining islands, Sicily, Sardinia and Corsica. Carthage had also become of great influence in North Africa; Alexandria in Egypt and Antioch (now the oldest of the large churches) held a similar position in Syria and in relation to the farther East. A great number of cities, not so import-

ant as these, were yet large enough to work similar effects in the history of the Church. Consequently, a new class was forming among the clergy in those bishops over bishops in the jurisdiction of the metropolitan cities, not yet legally constituted, but practically working. They were designated bishops of the first seat (*primæ sedis episcopi*) or first bishops (*primi*). Such a one was considered as having the right to convoke councils of the bishops of his province and to preside in them, and in the intervals the right of judicature in matters affecting any bishop of the province.

Among the opponents whom Christianity had to encounter in argument, the ablest were still the Neo-Platonist philosophers, of whom by far the chief was Plotinus, to whom the system was indebted for its completeness. His own work was executed in the foregoing period; but his influence against Christianity, indirect, and by the nature of his speculations, was stronger after his death through some of his pupils. One of them, Porphyry of Tyre, flourished between 260 and 305; his argument against Christianity was a large work extending to fifteen books. It is not extant as a whole, but portions of it remain quoted in the writings of Christians.

Of Hierocles, an eclectic philosopher, we learn chiefly from the notice taken of his book by Lactantius and from the reply to it by Eusebius. It was composed during the final persecution and called *Words of a Truth-Lover to the Christians*. Hierocles not only wrote against Christianity, but also bears the blame of having instigated that persecution which unequally brands the

name of Diocletian. He was governor of Bithynia under that emperor.

Jamblichus of Chalcis, in Cælo-Syria, wrote a work on the life and philosophy of Pythagoras in which he introduced arguments designed to resist the progress of Christianity. Jamblichus enjoyed the highest philosophical reputation in his time, which was the first thirty years of the fourth century.

The chief theological question of the time still related to the person of Christ—now as a Person in the Godhead, thereby involving discussion of the Trinity, and that the more closely determined by the bearings of the Alexandrian theology.

Among Christian authors in Latin were Commodianus and Arnobius, both of North Africa, and Lactantius. Commodianus, the earliest Christian poet in Latin, was author of a poem on the evidences of Christianity, written about 270. Arnobius, about 305, published an apologetic work called *A Disputation against the Gentiles*. The writings of Lactantius are of much more importance in defence of Christian doctrine against heathenism and heathen philosophy, and in more elegant Latin than any of his Christian predecessors had been able to command. He died between 325 and 330.

Among errorists, Paul of Samosato, bishop of Antioch, was charged with preaching a heresy similar to that of Sabellius, and with conduct otherwise unbecoming a minister of the gospel. In a council at Antioch (268) he was tried and deposed, but, protected by Zenobia, queen of Palmyra, he continued in office. When Aurelian had defeated Zenobia (272), the council appealed to him to enforce their decision, and he, after

consulting with the bishop of Rome, constrained Paul to give place to the bishop appointed by the council.

In Egypt a schism took place during the Diocletian persecution. Meletius, bishop of Lycopolis, in the Thebaïd, for some cause not satisfactorily explained broke off his connection with the bishop of Alexandria. Several other Egyptian bishops joined him and resisted all attempts to bring them back to metropolitan allegiance. Whatever else was in it, it was certainly one of several cases of resistance on the part of parochial bishops to the increasing aggressions of the metropolitans.

In that (Diocletian) persecution it was exacted of Christians to surrender the Scriptures to be destroyed. Those who submitted were counted among the lapsed as *traditores*.

The most remarkable heresy of the latter half of the third century came from the side of Persia, and consisted in a combination of some elements of Christianity with some of later Avestanism and of Buddhism. Its author was Mani, Manes or Manichæus, a Persian, who appeared as a religious teacher in the Eastern Church about 270.

Mani was regarded by his followers as the incarnation of the Holy Spirit. In their estimation all his writings were divine Scripture. Only such parts of the New Testament as suited their views were accepted by them. They had also their esoteric and exoteric instructions for two different classes of their people—their auditors and their elect. The latter constituted their sacerdotal class in the highest stage of sanctification. The auditors were their common members, who

were taught that their imperfect righteousness could be raised to completeness by obtaining an interest in the superabundant righteousness of the elect.

From the elect were chosen the presiding officers of the Manichæan Church, the orders of which were: first, Mani (the embodied Paraclete), after his death represented by a sacerdotal chief; second, twelve *magistri* (masters); and third, seventy-two bishops, with their respective subordinates, "presbyters, deacons and itinerant evangelists."

After their founder's death this sect collected many adherents, especially in the East and in North Africa, although they suffered much persecution from both Persian and Roman authorities. Mani was himself put to death by King Bahram I. of Persia about 277.

By the beginning of the fourth century a large amount of property had come into the hands of Christians, and in some places their church-edifices were of great elegance. Such was that of Nicomedia, destroyed in the Diocletian persecution. No pictures or religious symbols were allowed in them, although such were used on tombs and on household utensils. In the catacombs are found the monogram of the name of Christ, the dove, the fish, the cross and other symbols. In Christian worship and observances certain symbolical numbers were of frequent occurrence.

PERIOD SECOND.

(325-1517.)

UNION OF THE CHURCH WITH THE STATE.

WITH the accession of Constantine to the undivided throne Christianity assumed a new position in the world. Yoked with the State as the sole authorized religion, the Church accepted the new features of the imperial organization, thus suffering her evangelical instruction to be bound by the chains of human law. Her freedom, for a hundred years before gradually sinking under an ecclesiastical aristocracy, was soon, by alliance with the civil power, to be completely submerged. Her own government contracted practices and principles from the temporal government, and her true spiritual self came into slavery to this complex power. Nor did a successful effort for relief from that depression occur in less than twelve hundred years.

Within that long period, extending to the early part of the sixteenth century, various changes took place marking several subordinate steps of progress or decline.

CHAPTER I.

THE NEW IMPERIAL CONSTITUTION.

(325-395.)

FIRST of those subordinate sections is that of the rapid decline of heathenism, the principal rites of which fell into disuse at its end.

With Constantine's victory at Adrianople, Diocletian's plan of government disappeared. Another was substituted. While the sovereign was to be one, the four-fold division of territory was to be retained under the names of the prefectures of Gaul, of Italy, of Illyricum and of the East, over which were appointed civil officers called "prefects." The prefectures were divided into dioceses governed by vicars, and the dioceses into provinces under the administration of rectors, or presidents. Each province was divided into small districts, with a corresponding distribution of inferior civil officers. Rome was no longer to be the imperial residence. Byzantine, on the Bosphorus, was chosen, rebuilt, and consecrated the Christian capital of the reconstituted empire. A similar disposal was made of the army, under its own proper commanders, and honors and titles of honor were graduated from the emperor downward. The reins of these ramified authorities were gathered together in

the hands of one imperial monarch, whose office was to be hereditary.

In that system Christianity took its place. During the preceding period the order of the Church had been growing into such a shape that no act of violence was needed to effect a general conformity. Yet it took some time to complete the parallelism of ranks, ecclesiastical and civil. As respects the higher jurisdictions, this was never absolutely attained. Not until the General Council at Constantinople in 381 was the superiority of the bishops of a diocese over the bishops of the provinces, and of the diocesan synods over the provincial synods, legally established. Both were regularly-constituted church courts, and met at the call of their respective superior bishops.

As in the civil and military so in the ecclesiastical system the emperor was the head of authority, convoked General Councils and presided in them personally or by his commissioner, and he alone could give the force of law to their acts.

The first council called by an emperor was that of Arles, in 314, and the first General Council of the Church met at Nice, in Bithynia, in 325, at the command and under the personal presidency of Constantine.

The order of ranks in the ministry recognized after the second General Council were those of exarchs, otherwise called archbishops, ruling each over the churches within a diocese of the empire; second, metropolitans, also sometimes called archbishops, ruling each over the churches of a province; third, bishops, rulers each over a smaller see, consisting of one or a few congre-

gations ministered to by himself and his presbyters; fourth, the presbyter-pastors, in the great city churches—not permanently installed in separate parishes, but appointed as supplies by the bishop: the separate pastors of single congregations in small places were bishops; and fifth, the deacons and other inferior officers, who also all belonged to the mother-church of their own city, not to its congregations.¹

According to this system, presbyters and the lower clergy were to be chosen by the bishops, but only gradually did that rule supplant the older one of election by the people of their respective charges. The bishops were to be chosen by their colleagues in the province and the other clergy.² Still, the approval of the people was not rejected, and, especially in the West, was often decisive, if not imperative.

Constantine died in 337, having received baptism only a few days before his death. His sons, Constantine, Constantius and Constans, divided the empire among them, but in the course of successive civil wars it came, in 350, into the hands of Constantius alone. In 361, Julian, a nephew of Constantine I., came to the possession of sole dominion. An admirer of heathen literature and philosophy, he attempted to re-establish polytheism and the old heathen worship, but his reign was too brief to effect the design. He fell in battle with the Persians in 363. Jovian, who succeeded him, in a brief reign of seven months repealed all the laws of Julian adverse to Christianity. After his death the empire was again divided into Eastern and Western with much irregularity until

¹ Bingham, i. 191, etc.

² Schaff, ii. 239.

392, when it was united under Theodosius. After his death, in 395, it was divided between his two sons, the West to Honorius, and to Arcadius the East. It was never united again.

By some Christian emperors heathenism was forbidden under severe penalties. Constantine II. prohibited public sacrifice, but that law could not be carried into effect at such centres of concourse as Rome and Alexandria. Theodosius interdicted the payment of its expenses from the imperial treasury, and forthwith it was discontinued.

But heathen ideas had already begun to make invasion into the sphere of Christian thought. In the beginning of the fourth century *monasticism* appears as a recognized style of religious life within the Church. Not that the Church originated any monastic order, but that a large number of Christian people came to esteem that way of living as one of eminent sanctity. Its institutions, organized originally by laymen, looked to the Christian public for approval, and very largely received it, although without institution of Christ.

Retirement to seclusion for meditation and prayer in order to return to the duties of social life with more truth and efficiency is not monastic; its aim is not to desert what we owe to community, but to acquire proper qualification for the discharge of duty. During the Decian persecution some Christians of Egypt fled to the desert and there gave themselves up entirely to austerities: what was undoubtedly scriptural for recurring seasons seemed to them best for unremitting practice. Public attention was turned to the subject

in 311 by the grotesque appearance of the hermit Antonius in a procession in Alexandria. He had begun to preach the attractions of his practices six years before in the desert, and found visitors to admire and imitate them. After a number of hermits had assembled in one another's neighborhood, a place of common habitation was founded for them by Pachomius on an island in the Nile. Soon afterward similar societies were formed in the deserts of Sketis and of Nitria, in Egypt, in the desert near Gaza, and elsewhere in Palestine and Syria. Thence the example extended to Armenia and Asia Minor, chiefly in desert places, but ere the end of the fourth century sometimes also in the neighborhood of cities. Some ascetics lived solitary, others in associations according to some common rule. Laymen were the first monks, but their way of life was held in such esteem by the Christian public of those days that before long clergy of the highest rank belonged to their number.

Several persons in different quarters protested against monasticism and the growing prelatical aristocracy. Such were Aërius (d. 360), Jovinian (d. 388) and Vigilantius (d. 404); and Jerome (himself a monk), although he submitted to prelacy, urged considerations to restrain its pretensions. The great body of the Church was well pleased with the new relations to the State, and with the hierarchical ranks by which they seemed so well balanced with the civil authorities.

The fanaticism of provoking persecution had been reproved and resisted by Cæcilianus, elected bishop of Carthage in 311. A strong party opposed him, and set up Majorinus, and afterward Donatus, as their

bishop. The controversy continued long. In 313 the case was submitted to Constantine, who appointed a committee—of which the bishop of Rome was one—to investigate the matter. The decision was unfavorable to the Donatists, who expressed their dissatisfaction. The emperor then called a council to meet at Arles, whose decision was also adverse to them. Application was then made to the emperor himself, who gave the same decision. Notwithstanding, the party maintained its existence in Africa until the province was overrun by the Vandals.

Of doctrinal controversy, the most momentous was the Arian. Origen had taught that the divine Logos proceeds from the will¹ of God the Father continually and from all eternity,² that he is the embodied wisdom of God³—God in an inferior degree to the Father, and not participant of his self-subsistent essence.⁴ Dionysius of Alexandria was charged with teaching such a difference between the Father and the Son as to make the latter a creature. If such was his meaning, he subsequently withdrew from it. But Arius, a pupil of the Syrian school, and a presbyter in Alexandria, boldly accepted the doctrine of creation—but creation once for all—teaching, also, that the divine Logos was the only created of the Father, that all other things were created by the Logos, that he is perfect and as like God as a created being can be, but of different substance from his Creator.

This view was condemned by Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, in 318, but many clergy in Syria and Asia

¹ *De Prin.*, i., ch. 2. 6.

² *Ibid.*, i. 2. 4, 11.

³ *Ibid.*, i. 2. 12.

⁴ Shedd, i. 29.

Minor declared themselves in favor of it. The controversy soon extended to the whole East. Attempts were made by the emperor Constantine to bring the discord to an end through means of friendly correspondence with leading men, but without effect. Finally he called a council of the whole Church to meet at Nice, in Bithynia (325), for the purpose of settling the dispute. The cause of the bishop of Alexandria was plead by Athanasius, then a deacon of that church, and by others. Arius was defended by a strong party, but was condemned as guilty of heresy. The faith of the Church was declared to be that the divine Logos is uncreated. The council also drew up a brief confession of the orthodox faith. Action was taken in respect to the difference between the practice of the Eastern and Western churches in the observation of Easter by giving judgment in favor of the West. Three hundred and eighteen bishops are said to have attended the council, with a larger number of other clergy. Most of the Arian members submitted to the doctrinal decision, though with reluctance on some points, especially on the consubstantiality of the Father and Son in deity. A minority preferred to say that the Son was of nature similar to the Father, and on that semi-Arian ground took their stand in opposition to the council, and obtained many adherents, chiefly in the East. In the course of ten years they were strong enough to depose Athanasius from the bishopric of Alexandria, to which he had been elevated after the council. He found refuge in the West.

After a long-continued controversy and multiplication of party sections the emperor Theodosius called a

second General Council to meet at Constantinople in 381. One hundred and fifty bishops assembled. The Nicene Creed was revised, its doctrine of the Trinity was confirmed, and articles were added touching heresies which had arisen since it was framed. In this latter form the Creed became the universally recognized symbol of orthodoxy. Pure Arianism subsequently declined within the empire, but maintained itself among the Germanic nations. Semi-Arianism prevailed among the Eastern churches, while the Nicene doctrines were accepted in the West.

Theodosius was the last to hold the reins of the united empire. The same year in which he died (395) the Huns upon the north broke into the provinces of Pannonia and Mœsia, and the Goths took up arms for invasion of Thrace, Macedonia and Greece, which they effected next year. Ere that time church government, under the constitution devised by Constantine, had become solidified into one organic self-sustaining structure imbued with the spirit of a new and vigorous life with which the civil government had nothing to correspond.

CHRONOLOGY FROM A. D. 395 TO 451.

Emperors.		Popes.	Patriarchs of Constantinople.	Patriarchs of Antioch.	Patriarchs of Alexandria.	Patriarchs of Jerusalem.
Western.	Eastern.					
395 Honorius, 423	395 Arcadius, 408	399 Anastasius I., 402	397 Chrysostom, 404	381 Flavianus, 404	395 Theophilus, 412	386 John, 416
		402 Innocent,	417 404 Arsacius, 405	404 Porphyrius, 414	412 Cyril, 444	416 Praylus, 428
		417 Zozimus,	418 406 Atticus, 425	414 Alexander, 421		428 Juvenalis,
	408 Theodosius II.	418 Boniface I., 423		421 Theodotus, 429		
		423 Celestine I., 432	426 Sisinnius, 427	429 John I., 442		
		432 Sixtus III., 440	428 Nestorius, deposed, 431	442 Domnus II., deposed, 449	444 Dioscorus, deposed, 451	
424 Valentinian III.,		440 Leo I.,	431 Maximianus, 434			
			434 Proclus, 447	449 Maximus I.,		
			447 Flavianus, 449		451 Proterius,	
			449 Anatolius, 458	455		
	450 Marcian, 457					458
455			461		460	

CHAPTER II.

DOCTRINAL DEFINITION.

(395-451.)

ANOTHER period of church history worthy of consideration by itself is that which extends from the death of Theodosius to the General Council of Chalcedon. It was then that the doctrines of the Church defined by the ancient classic Fathers were digested into a philosophical system. It was also then that the Arian Goths, Suevi and Vandals made themselves masters of the Spanish peninsula and of the South of Gaul, while heathen Franks took possession of Northern Gaul and Saxons began their conquest of South Britain. In 427 the Vandals passed over from Spain into Africa, and conquered the whole of that province before 439. They also reduced Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica and the Balearic Islands. The Alemanni and the Burgundians had taken possession of Helvetia and of Eastern Gaul. At the middle of the fifth century little remained to the Western empire beyond the confines of Italy.

Meanwhile, the Church stood firm and received a large addition to her subjects—not very orthodox or enlightened, it is true, but all, except Franks and Saxons, making Christian profession. The native

populations of the provinces were not removed or extinguished: they were only subdued and governed by Germans instead of by Romans. They—or, at least, their clergy—were orthodox. Among the Goths, Arian doctrine had been taught by Ulphilas in the fourth century. The Burgundians came into the Church (413) with the profession of orthodoxy, but in 450 adopted Arianism.

As a general thing, the Arian masters did not interfere with the religion of their orthodox subjects; but the Visigoths in the South of France and the Vandals in Africa were exceptions to the rule. Christianity received an additional load of corruption from those ill-taught and partially-changed heathen nations.

From the beginning of the fifth to the beginning of the seventh century the churches in the British isles were cut off from Rome by the withdrawal of Roman arms, and by the interposition of heathen Franks in North Gaul and of heathen Saxons on their own southern and eastern coasts. In 423, Theodosius II., emperor of the East, issued an edict in which he expressed his belief that no heathen were to be found within his dominions.

In the process of framing such an expression of Christian belief as should be satisfactory to the Church it was impossible to avoid controversy. It was by controversy that the work had to be done. It must be admitted that toward the Middle Ages controversial zeal often degenerated into party malignity, until difference of theological opinion came to be deemed cause of death; but, aside from the bad temper displayed, we look with the highest respect upon those

ancient controversies whereby the fundamental principles of systematic theology were critically and closely defined. The Arian and semi-Arian controversies constrained to the clearest statement of scriptural doctrine on the subject of the Trinity. In the Nicene Creed, as revised and extended at Constantinople, were summed up the best results of previous theological discussion, the work chiefly of Greek theologians: Latin writers make comparatively little figure in it. Law, civil and moral, was the field of thought in which those who spoke the Latin tongue had proved themselves superior to all rivals. Now a work remained to be done for the Church which better than any others they were qualified to do. That was twofold: *first*, definition of the scriptural doctrine of man's relations to God; *second*, the complete systematic and practical statement and exposition of the whole body of truth as then defined or accepted.

During the Gothic invasion of Italy, in the year 410, Pelagius, a native of Britain who had been residing in Rome, appears among the refugees to Sicily. He thence proceeded to Africa, accompanied by his friend Cœlestius and others. From Africa he soon afterward went to Palestine, leaving Cœlestius at Carthage. Cœlestius, applying to be ordained as presbyter, was charged with errors tending to exalt unscripturally human free will. He was excluded from the church at Carthage and went to Ephesus. His doctrines were thought to be the same as those held by Pelagius. Accordingly, Pelagius was himself accused before the bishop of Jerusalem, within whose jurisdiction he was then residing, and afterward (415) before

the Synod of Diospolis, as Lydda in Palestine was then called, but without being condemned. Other councils in various quarters rejected his doctrines. Zosimus, bishop of Rome, first approved, and afterward condemned, them. They found acceptance and defence especially in the East. In the West their principal advocate was Julian, bishop of Eclanum, in Italy.

The Pelagian theologians held that man's moral nature received no injury in the fall of Adam; that man is now born, as fully as Adam was made, able to do the will of God; that all sin consists in the intelligent choice of evil; and that in order to turn from sin unto righteousness nothing is needed but a change of purpose on the part of the sinner. A higher degree of blessedness and greater facility in attaining it are accessible through Christian sacraments and instruction. As the law was formerly given to facilitate the attainment of goodness, so latterly are the gospel and the example of Christ and particular operations of grace. The divine purpose for man's salvation is founded upon the divine foreknowledge of human action, and makes no demand which man has not full ability to comply with.

Among the opponents of Pelagius were Jerome and Augustin. The latter wrought out those statements of the doctrines of grace which lie at the springs of orthodox theology. The views of Augustin were ecclesiastically confirmed by the African synods and the Western Church generally. Pelagianism, under the name of Cœlestius, was condemned at the General Council of Ephesus, in 431. But the Augustinian

doctrines of grace and predestination were not adopted by Eastern Christians. After the action of the council complete Pelagianism ceased to be professed to any great extent, while an intermediate ground which may be called semi-Pelagian was taken by many churches in the East. It was also accepted by some theologians in the West as introduced by John Cassian, a pupil of Chrysostom.

Augustin, greatest of all the ancient Christian theologians, was a native of Africa, born at Tagaste, in Numidia, in 354, studied and practiced the profession of rhetoric, was not converted until over thirty-three years of age, became bishop of Hippo, in Africa (395), where he continued to labor until his death (August 28, 430). His writings are voluminous. The greatest is the *De Civitate Dei*, a comparative history of the kingdom of God upon earth. Next to that are his treatises on Pelagianism and Manichæism.

The work of Augustin determined the systematic anthropology and soteriology of the Catholic Church—at least, for the West. Eastern theologians still found points in their favorite theme of the Trinity to create dispute for ages to come. The controversy about the Sonship of Christ in Godhead was followed by one touching the relation of the divine Logos to the human nature of Jesus.

Sabellius and others who taught a modal Trinity at an earlier day conceived that the Son of God took to himself only a human body. Such was also the view adopted by Arius. Apollinaris, bishop of Laodicea from 362 to 375, holding that man consisted of body, spirit and soul, believed that Jesus had no human

soul and that the divine Logos took its place. Some theologians were the more disposed to accept that view that they believed the soul in common men to be part of God. Apollinarianism was rejected by the General Council at Constantinople in 381; its author died in 390. The worship of its adherents was prohibited by civil authority.

On the other hand, the majority of theologians conceived of Jesus as a complete man united to the divine Logos so intimately as to constitute of the two only one Christ—a doctrine which, in handling by different persons, assumed various facets. Nestorius, a leader in the Oriental party, was made bishop of Constantinople in 428, and proceeded boldly to maintain the faith in which he believed. In the formal statement of his doctrine he maintained that the two natures in Christ are so united as to make only one person. But in controversy with such bold language did he defend the duality of the natures that he made too little of the singleness of person. According to his way of illustrating it, the union seemed to be only a very intimate alliance. His opponents felt thereby provoked to charge him, notwithstanding his remonstrance, with teaching the doctrine of two persons in Christ. But even that heresy would have excited less passion had it stood alone. The essential element of Nestorianism cut away the foundation upon which theologians defended the popular reverence—fast becoming worship—of the Virgin Mary as the “mother of God.” Nestorius denied that epithet to her whom he was willing to call the “mother of Christ.” The idolatrous spirit resisted him with rage. It was this

which gave the popular fire and fury to the subsequent controversy, making even public worship sometimes a scene of tumultuous uproar in applause or disapproval of the preacher.

The General Council called to meet at Ephesus in 431 acted in the spirit of the mob. Cyril of Alexandria, an ambitious man of ability and learning, but also of violent temper, assumed the leadership of the Church in opposition to Nestorius. Under his management, and before the Oriental bishops had arrived, Nestorius was condemned and deposed by mere acclamation. The Eastern bishops, upon their arrival, retaliated. Appeal was made to the emperor, but, intimidated by the tumultuous rejoicings of the populace, he shrunk from any step to secure a fair trial. The act of the council was allowed to take effect. In the course of two years, through the mediation of John, bishop of Antioch, the Egyptian and Syrian bishops were reconciled. But Nestorius, who had taken refuge in a cloister at Antioch, was banished to one place after another, until he died, soon after 439, in Upper Egypt. A large part of the Oriental Church, chiefly that lying to the east of the Euphrates, accepted his doctrines, and those who, under the rule of the Persian kings, had been subjected to severe and long-continued oppression, after adoption of Nestorianism, finding themselves under censure of the churches to the westward, separated from them (498) and from their relations to the empire, and subsequently received protection from Persia as loyal subjects. In the Catholic Church the result of the controversy was not only to condemn the heresy with which Nestorius was charged, but also to

give the highest ecclesiastical sanction to the worship of the Virgin Mary.

But the question was not yet fully settled in the Catholic Church. Eutyches, an abbot in Constantinople, was in 448 condemned by a provincial council in that city for teaching that the human in Christ was so merged in the divine as to make only one nature, and that a deified human nature—the one so identified with the other that God was subjected to all the conditions of the human, was born, suffered, was crucified and died. A letter from Leo I. of Rome to Flavian, bishop of Constantinople, approved of the action of that council and expounded what he thought the true doctrine of the two natures in one person in Christ. Cyril of Alexandria died in 444. His successor, Dioscorus, a man of similar ambition and of still more violent temper, sustained the doctrine of one nature. A General Council met at Ephesus in 449. Dioscorus as president, and defended by a retinue of monks and armed men, procured a decision in favor of Eutyches and the Alexandrian doctrine and an act of deposition against Flavian and Leo, and others who defended the opposite view. Flavian suffered such violence at the hands of the monks that a few days later he died of his wounds. From its disgraceful violence, that council was branded as a council of robbers. Its action was sustained by the emperor, Theodosius II.; but next year Theodosius died, and the new emperor, Marcian, took the other side. A new General Council was called, and met at Chalcedon in 451. It is counted the fourth, the second at Ephesus being utterly rejected by both branches of the Catholic Church.

At Chalcedon, Eutyches was condemned of heresy, Dioscorus was condemned and deposed, Nestorianism was also rejected, Leo's letter to Flavian was approved, while the council, in a clear and admirable confession, gave its own statement of the doctrine of "*one Christ—truly God and truly man—in two natures*, the two natures united *without confusion, without conversion and inseparable*, the distinction of the natures being in no wise abolished by their union, but the peculiarity of each nature being maintained, and both concurring in one person and hypostasis."

The council also recognized the existing metropolitan and patriarchal ranks of bishops, and sanctioned the latter as a higher rank and as endowed with higher powers of jurisdiction. At that date the patriarchs were five—those of Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem. By a canon of the council the patriarchs of the two imperial capitals were entitled to higher honor than the rest.

Both forms of the Creed—the Nicene and the Constantinopolitan—were confirmed, and also certain canons of five provincial councils—namely, of Ancyra, 313; of Neo-Cæsarea, in Pontus, 315 or 316; of Gangra, between 325 and 341; of Antioch in Syria, 341; and of Laodicea, about 365.

The cardinal subject of Christian doctrine is the person of Christ. The principal controversies concerning it thus far were :

I. With Judaism, proving that Jesus is the Christ, the promised One, the Son of God, and in himself the sufficient Saviour. Secondly, with Docetæ, in defence of his true humanity, that he was not a mere phantom.

II. Concerning his divine nature as related to God the Father and the Holy Spirit, discussed in speculations of Gnosticism, in debates on Montanism and Manichæism, and, historically parallel with these, certain Monarchian theories—Humanitarian, Patripassian, Sabellian and those errors which sprang out of the theology of Origen, especially that of Arius and of the semi-Arians.

III. Touching the relations of the divine to the human in Christ, in opposition to the Apollinarian doctrine on one side and the Nestorian on the other, and to that of Eutyches and Dioscorus, opening the way to Monophysitism.

IV. Questions of Christian anthropology were brought out chiefly as related to the work of Christ, but also in treating points of discipline, until the rise of Pelagianism, into the discussion of which they entered systematically. The rejection of Pelagianism left behind, especially in the Eastern empire, the more widespread and enduring heresy of semi-Pelagianism. The doctrines of grace as defined by Augustin were accepted as orthodox in the churches of the West.

Christian sacraments and originally simple customs were now surrounded with a parade of ceremonial forms, pictures were introduced into churches—not yet as objects of worship, but as helps to piety—and some things were retained from the old state religion, converted to Christian meaning, under the plea that people accustomed to see them would thereby be attracted to church. Preaching had also assimilated to the character of secular harangues, and—in some of the city churches, at least—it had become not unusual for the

congregations to give noisy demonstrations of their disapproval or applause.

The memory of martyrs received such a degree of veneration that preachers would appeal to them in their sermons and invoke their intercession with God. Their relics were collected and deposited in churches. The Virgin Mary received peculiar reverence, and the cross—all along honored as a symbol of the sufferings of Christ—had become an object of idolatrous veneration, intensified after Helena, the mother of Constantine, had discovered, as she thought, the true cross on which the Saviour died.

The clergy began to wear a peculiar costume as becoming the ministers of the state religion. After heathen fashion, artificial lights were used in some churches in the daytime. Festival days increased in number, and some formerly of only local observance became general or were appointed to be held with more regularity. Not long before 360, probably in the time of Julius I., the Roman Church began to observe the 25th of December as commemorative of the Lord's Nativity. From Rome the practice extended to other places—to Antioch about 376, and to Alexandria about 430.

By the middle of the fifth century the schools of the Church had begun to decline with the interest in education which had maintained them. Monks had grown numerous, and their extravagant barbarism was fast degrading the popular idea of piety to that of Oriental fanaticism. Some of them were men of learning, but in general they were ignorant, despised learning and wielded a powerful influence against it.

The arrest of education bears its fruits not immediately, but after only one generation.

Many of the evils of the time were due to the haste with which multitudes of half-converted heathen were received into Christian communion upon simple profession, made, in many cases, only because their kings had been converted. After the full establishment of Christianity as the state religion, when the practice of heathenism became unlawful, the Church assumed all the population of the empire as her proper charge. The strict rules of the early Christians touching admission to their communion were thus done away with or rendered inoperative. It was a stupendous effort to which the early Church was called, the regeneration of a world lying in iniquity—deep and almost hopeless iniquity. It is not strange that the human agency was sometimes at fault, that mistakes were made, and that some of the overflowing corruption invaded her own bounds. The subject of wonder is that the good was not entirely swamped in the billows of evil raging on every side.

CHRONOLOGY FROM A. D. 451 TO 476—THE END OF THE WESTERN EMPIRE

Emperors.		Popes.	Patriarchs of Constantinople.	Patriarchs of Antioch.	Patriarchs of Alexandria.	Patriarchs of Jerusalem.
Western.	Eastern.					
455 Avitus, 457 Majorian, 461 Severus, 464 Vacancy, 467 Anthemius, 471 Olybrius, 472 Glycerius, 473 Nepos, 474 Romulus Augustulus, 476	457 Leo I., 474	468 Simplicius, 483	468 Gennadius, 471	456 Basilus, 458 Acacius, 460 Marrytus (resigned), 471 Peter the Fuller, 471 Julian, deposed 475 Peter the Fuller, deposed 478 Stephen II.,	460 Soteriolius, 468 Timotheus, Eulmus, rival B., 477	458 Anastasius, 478
End of the Western Empire.		483 Felix III., 492			462 John Talalas, deposed 462 Peter Mongus, 490	478 Marrytus, 489
Kingdom of Italy.						

CHRONOLOGY FROM A. D. 476 TO 607.

[illegible]

CHAPTER III.

PATRIARCHAL RIVALRY.

(431-607.)

FROM the Council of Chalcedon to the death of Boniface III., bishop of Rome, was a period of rivalry for sole dominion in the Church between the patriarchs of Rome and of Constantinople. By the council they had been recognized as entitled to higher honor than the rest. From that date it became an object of ambition with both to secure, each for his own see, the admitted title of sole superiority. One sovereign or universal bishop, with four patriarchates, was needed to complete the system of Church government after the model of the State. Already the three other patriarchs of the East acknowledged the superiority of Constantinople, the title of which had been repeatedly conferred by the emperor as of right belonging to the bishop of the Christian capital. The bishop of Rome had no rival patriarch in the West, and, the imperial arm now seldom reaching him, he was the highest authority in all respects in his own city. But his own city was now the head of only a very small province. The settlement of the question seemed to be admitted when John the Faster, patriarch of Constantinople, in 587 assumed the title of ecumenical or universal

bishop, as proper to his rank. Pelagius II. of Rome, and more severely Gregory I., condemned the iniquity of that episcopal ambition, and the latter declared his humility by preferring the title *servus servorum Dei*. But his successor in 607, Boniface III., obtained from the emperor Phocas also the title ecumenical, while retaining Gregory's humbler choice as the prouder honor. Both dignitaries, now ecumenical, were as much rivals as before, whilst the alienation was wider.

In the state the period thus defined was no less momentous. After their defeat at Chalons, in 451, the Huns fell back upon Italy, and the last remnant of the Western empire was spared for a few years only by the death of Attila. In 455 the Vandals crossed over from Africa to Italy, took Rome and plundered it. Until 472 the holders of nominal empire in the West were set up by German leaders. Finally, in 476, Odoacer, king of the Herulians and leader of the German troops in Roman pay, himself assumed the sovereignty under the title of king of Italy. In 492, Odoacer was overthrown, and the Gothic kingdom of Italy was set up by Theodoric. That kingdom was extinguished by the forces of the Eastern empire under command of Belisarius in 539, and afterward of Narses. Italy thereby became a Byzantine province until the invasion of the Lombards, in 568, when it was divided between them and the Eastern empire, the capital of the former being Pavia, and the seat of the Greek exarch Ravenna. Rome had ceased to be of any general political importance.

In Gaul the Franks secured supreme dominion. The Visigoths, whom they drove out of the South

of that country in 507, had before that date subdued the Suevi and set up the Gothic kingdom of Spain. The Saxons in Britain had established their dominion over all the best of England and driven the Romanized Britons to the West. On the other hand, the Vandals in Africa and Sicily were reduced by the arms of Belisarius, and those countries were annexed to the Eastern empire.

In Constantinople the imperial authority, after 454, passed through a succession of feeble hands, until Justinian, from 527 to 565, by the wisdom of his legal digest and the success of his arms, went far toward a restoration of the imperial dignity. Laws for the Church followed the example of the civil law.

In the fifth century we find mention of the Apostolical Constitutions and the Apostolical Canons. In the sixth century appeared the collection of Dionysius Exiguus in the West, and of Johannes Scholasticus in the East, and an improved work was prepared by Isidore of Seville in the seventh century, laying the foundations upon which afterward arose the structure of the canon law.

In the history of theology the principal feature of the time was the prolonged Monophysite controversy. The Council of Chalcedon, after deposing Dioscorus from the patriarchate of Alexandria, appointed Proterius in his room. But a large party in Egypt refused to acknowledge the new bishop or the doctrine of the council. Various names were given them, but the most common was "Monophysite," expressive of their doctrine of oneness of nature in Christ. The headquarters of the controversy were Antioch and Alex-

andria, the two great theological schools of the East. Both parties carried violence to an extreme disgraceful to their Christian profession. Emperors stepped in to allay the ferment, but their efforts failed. Justinian defended the Council of Chalcedon, while endeavoring to restore unity and peace. The empress Theodora favored the Monophysites, and also professed to labor for conciliation. Neither had much success. Finally, in 553, the emperor called a General Council to meet at Constantinople. The council condemned Monophysite doctrine as heresy. The result was a secession of Monophysite churches covering a belt of country from the northern borders of Armenia, through Mesopotamia, Syria, Palestine and Egypt, to the southern extremities of Ethiopia. It did much to reduce the importance of both Alexandria and Antioch as seats of theological learning—a loss never retrieved.

The disgraceful scenes which occurred in the course of this controversy were chiefly due to the part taken in it by the monks, who now swarmed in all Oriental Christendom in such numbers as seriously to diminish the ranks of industry. If merely to be in earnest were true godliness, the highest merit could not be denied to most of them; but so to judge would be to transform Christianity into fanaticism. Some of their extravagances would be incredible were they not testified to by eye-witnesses. Such were the Stylite saints, one of whom, called Simeon, died in 459, after having lived thirty-seven years on the top of a pillar. In the West such wild extremes of asceticism never met with favor: legally-regulated order held it within bounds. Benedict of Nursia, in the year 529, founded a monas-

tery on Mount Casinus, in Italy, with a system of rules whereby the time of the monks was distributed in a strict and sensible way between devotion and manual labor. For many generations its working was enforced with more than military severity. The rule of Benedict was the true foundation of Western monasticism, to which Cassiodorus, in the same century, is said to have added the duty of literary labor.

In 496, Clovis, king of the Franks, induced by the entreaties of his queen, a Burgundian princess, and by certain circumstances of his life, assumed the profession of Christianity. His sister and three thousand of his army were baptized on the same occasion and came into the Church professing the orthodox faith. The whole nation soon followed the example.

In receiving the title "universal" the bishop of Rome enjoyed the imperial gift of the highest honor as a minister of religion. It was, however, an empty honor, for the Byzantine patriarch never withdrew his pretensions, and the Eastern Church never admitted that of Rome; but it was a ground whereon every effort to establish a real ecclesiastical monarchy could be justified.

In the fifth century we enter upon the period of time called the *Middle Ages*. Its true limits are, on one side, the extinction of the Western empire, in 476, and, on the other, the taking of Constantinople by the Turks, in 1453. During all that interval the Roman empire maintains itself in the East, while in the West it is dismembered and divided among foreign powers.

In taking a general view of the Middle Ages we

shall find *first* a process of dissolution extending, not to all the elements, but to all the structure, of civilization; *secondly*, a process of settlement of new nations and by new methods; *thirdly*, a process of growth in a new style of culture.

The Middle Ages are not all equally dark ages. Gloomiest are the latter years of the fifth century, all of the sixth, the seventh, most of the eighth, the whole of the tenth and the greater part of the eleventh.

At the beginning of the seventh century the popularity of Christian profession was at its highest. Heathenism had long ago become utterly unfashionable within the ancient bounds of the empire, and was fast melting away before the outward progress in all directions of Christian profession.

We may view the Church at that time as consisting of three grand divisions. First, there was the Latin Church, comprehending all the South-west of Europe and North of Africa; second, the Greek Church; and third, the heretical Oriental churches, consisting of the two sections, Monophysite and Nestorian, extending over North-eastern Africa and Western Asia, from Armenia as far east as India and to the western frontiers of China. Never before had the pride of dominion so filled the mind of the Christian world. The very losses of the civil power had brought new nations into allegiance to the Church. That success had not been attained without earnestness and truth of faith, but, unhappily, also with the introduction of many an error contracted from the old habits of nations converted in a day.

CHRONOLOGY FROM A. D. 607 TO 752.

Emperors of the East.	Popes.	Patriarchs of Constantinople.	Patriarchs of Antioch.	Patriarchs of Alexandria.	Patriarchs of Jerusalem.
610 Heraclius, 641	608 Boniface IV., 615 619 Deusdedit, 618 619 Boniface V., 625 625 Honorius I., 638 638 Severinus, 640 640 John IV., 642 642 Theodore I., 649 649 Martin I., 655 655 Eugenius I., 657 657 Vitalian, 672 672 Adeodatus, 676 676 Domnus, 678 678 Agatho, 681 681 Leo II., 683 683 Benedict II., 685 685 John V., 686 686 Conon, 687 687 Sergius I., 701 701 John VI., 705 705 John VII., 707 707 Sisinius, 708 708 Constantine I., 715 715 Gregory II., 731	610 Sergius, 638 639 Pyrrhus, 641 641 Paul II., 642 642 Pyrrhus, 654 654 Peter, 655 655 Thomas II., 666 666 John V., 669 669 Constantine, 675 675 Theodore, 686 686 George I., 687 687 Theodore, 693 693 Calinicus, 705 705 Cyrus, 712 712 John VI., 715 715 John VII., 731 731 Germanus, 741 741 Anastasius, 752 752 died, 754	610 The see vacant until 640 640 Macadonius, a Monothelite, resident at 616 616 George, a Monothelite, 630 630 Cyrus, a Monothelite, 643 643 Peter, No Catholic patriarch until 742 643 Theophanes, 685 685 Alexander II., 727 727 George II., 737 737 Stephen II., 744 744 Theophylact, 773 773 Theodorus, 773	607 Theodore Scribon, 616 616 Almoner, 616 616 Cyrus, a Monothelite, 630 630 Cyrus, a Monothelite, 643 643 Peter, No Catholic patriarch until 742 643 Theophanes, 685 685 Alexander II., 727 727 George II., 737 737 Stephen II., 744 744 Theophylact, 773 773 Theodorus, 773	609 Zachary, 632 632 Modestus, 634 634 City taken by the Moham-medans, Vancancy to 705, when John V. restored the succession, 754 754 Theodore.

Greek dominions in Italy ruled by the exarchs of Ravenna until the exarchate was conquered by the Lombards, and taken out of their hands by King Pepin in 752 to be given to the pope.

These three Oriental patriarchates, shaken and divided by the Nestorian controversy and secession, the more violent and prolonged Monophysite and Monothelite controversies, with the final secession of the larger part of their jurisdictions, followed by their subjugation to the Mohammedans, cease to be of their former importance in the general history of the Church. Their lists of patriarchs need not occupy any more space in this brief historic outline, except that of Jerusalem, which may be further continued, from its importance in the crusades.

CHAPTER IV.

HUMILIATION OF THE EASTERN CHURCHES.—INCREASING POWER OF THE WESTERN PATRIARCHATE.

(607-752.)

THE period intervening between the death of Boniface III. and the accession of Stephen II. (607 to 752) includes another stage in the progress of papalism. It is the interval between the first bishop of Rome who enjoyed the title "universal" and the first who took his place as a temporal prince—a time of great events.

About 611, Mohammed began to teach his doctrines in Mecca. His object was to overthrow idolatry and restore the worship of the one God of his father Abraham. The different portions of his religion were announced from time to time, as occasion called them forth, and after his death were combined in one book, the Koran.

Mohammed received Christ as a divine teacher and the greatest of the prophets and as miraculously born of the Virgin Mary, and taught that all should believe in him as the apostle of God, but not as the Son of God and a sufficient Saviour. It was the deplorable corruption of the Eastern Church—not so much in doctrine as in life and worship, and especially its practical idolatry—which gave to the single but sublime truth of Mohammedanism its early power.

Little progress was made by Mohammed in obtaining converts until he was constrained to flee to Medina by persecution in Mecca. This event—the Hejirah—which occurred on the 15th of July, 622, is the starting-point of the Mohammedan era. From that date Mohammed's fame increased and converts multiplied and attached themselves to his cause with great enthusiasm. At first he used only persuasion; afterward he received authority to compel assent to his doctrines by force of arms. He died in 632, asserting that God had given the world to be conquered for Islam.

First of the kalifs, or successors of Mohammed in office, was Abubeker. In his reign of two years he reduced all the countries between the Euphrates and the Mediterranean Sea. In 636 the last of the imperial troops were driven out of Syria; next year Jerusalem was taken. Egypt was reduced in 640, the greater part of Northern Africa in 647, and Persia in 651. By that date Mohammedan conquest had extended to the opposite extremes of Armenia and Nubia. It took in, also, Cyprus and Rhodes and advanced against Constantinople, which was saved by the use of the Greek fire. From Mauritania it passed into Spain (711), overran almost all the peninsula, crossed the Pyrenees into the heart of France, and in 732 met its first check in the valley of the Loire from the army of the Franks, under command of Charles Martel.

Thus within one hundred years the Christian Church was overrun and trampled down in Arabia, Persia, Syria, Egypt, Northern Africa and the greater part of the Spanish peninsula. The patriarchate of Con-

stantinople was shorn of a large part of its jurisdiction; that of Rome, if we count in her claims to North Africa, was diminished by nearly one-half; those of Antioch, Jerusalem and Alexandria were entirely reduced to dependencies of the Saracen; and the Nestorian churches of the farther East were overwhelmed and for centuries—many of them for ever—disappeared from history. In Italy the Greek exarchate gradually broke down before the increasing strength of the Lombards, until, in 752, it came entirely into their possession. During the period of its existence the capital had been Ravenna. Rome was only the head of an inferior province of the Greek empire, in which the chief authority was the bishop. Christian Spain was not exterminated, but all except the Gothic population of the Asturias came under the domination of an anti-Christian power. In Northern Africa the Church was prostrated under the Saracenic rule without hope of relief.

The churches of the West, in view of such danger and loss, turned their eyes with the greater interest to their religious chief at the old capital. Rome, now feeble, still possessed a great inheritance of prestige, the superiority of a thousand years, the source of empire in the West and of religious observances many of which had come down from heathen times. The title and rank of sovereign pontiff, which had been worn by the heathen emperors as chiefs of the old state religion, and also by the first Christian emperors until declined by Gratian (375–383), was now accepted by the bishop of Rome, Theodore I., between 642 and 649. The churches in Spain, Gaul and Brit-

ain had little connection with that patriarchal capital, being governed by their own episcopal authorities in relation to the civil powers under which they lived. The pope was still a subject of the Eastern emperor, and had to be confirmed in office by him and to pay him taxes. Sometimes the imperial hand fell heavily upon a refractory pope, but such an act was always treasured up in memory and handed down to succeeding popes for repayment, and every advantage secured was thenceforward claimed as a right.

From the utter failure latterly of the secular arm to defend Rome, the pope was constrained to take upon himself that state business which he had no material force to sustain. Pepin, the son of Charles Martel, in 751 usurped the throne of France and applied to the pope for his sanction, which was granted. Pepin was anointed king, and the last Merovingian went into a cloister. Pope Zacharias died early the next year; his successor was Stephen II. The Lombards were making war upon the exarchate of Ravenna; before the end of the year they had reduced it. They next turned their arms against Rome. Stephen applied to the new king of France for aid. In the name of the empire, and as defender of its territory, Pepin led his forces into Italy, defeated the Lombards and saved Rome. Taking from his enemies what they had recently conquered from the emperor, he gave it to the pope. The districts contained in that gift constituted the skeleton of what was afterward embraced under the name "the States of the Church."

Thus the pope took his place as a secular prince.

He had also allied himself with a new and powerful

dynasty in the West, whose influence was exerted to bring the Gallican Church into closer relations to Rome. A point of authority was also established, in that the first king of the new dynasty had solicited papal sanction and accepted anointment from a legate of the pope. The papacy was put into possession of great wealth. Allegiance to the emperor at Constantinople was still recognized, but it had ceased to be more than nominal.

During this period the principal theological question was that concerning the singleness or the duality of will in Christ. When the emperor Heraclius was in Syria, from 622, he became more intimately acquainted with the condition of the Monophysites, and was persuaded that the principal obstacle to their returning into the Catholic Church might be removed by a statement of doctrine representing the nature of Christ as twofold, but the will as one. Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, was consulted on the subject, and expressed his opinion that such a view was not inconsistent with the Creed of the Church. Several theologians of the East coincided with him. Cyrus, patriarch of Alexandria, accepted the doctrine, and made some progress in reconciling the two parties within his diocese. Action to that effect was taken by a council in Alexandria in 633; but Sophronius, a clear-thinking Palestinian monk, happened to be there at the time, and declared his opposition. He became patriarch of Jerusalem next year, and used his increased influence to promote the rising excitement of controversy. Sergius of Constantinople succeeded in enlisting Honorius, bishop of Rome, on his side. Thus the patriarchs of Constanti-

nople, Rome and Alexandria were arrayed on the Monothelite side against the patriarch of Jerusalem.

Sophronius, however, had the advantage of his opponents in point of logic, and his reasoning soon convinced the greater number of theologians; but he was silenced by the Mohammedans, into whose hands he and his patriarchate fell in 637. He died soon after.

Forty-three years longer did the controversy rage in spite of imperial efforts to allay its fury, some of which efforts were as violent as its own. Finally, the emperor Constantine IV. called a General Council to meet at Constantinople in 680. It assembled in a hall of the palace called "Trullus." The emperor presided. The doctrine of two wills—that is, that in Christ there are two natures in one person, each nature possessing a will of its own—was accepted as scriptural, and the Monothelite doctrine of two natures in one person, with only one will, was condemned.

Under the emperor Philippicus Bardanes (711-713) the controversy was revived in the East, but for only a short time. Monothelites diminished in number and ultimately became limited to a small dissenting party, residing chiefly in the vicinity of Lebanon, who chose a patriarch of Antioch for themselves. A remnant of them still survives under the name "Maronites."

It was probably during the seventh century that the *Symbolum Quicumque*—commonly called "the Athanasian Creed"—appeared, by what authority drawn up or at what date is unknown. The earliest example of its adoption as a symbol of orthodoxy is in a canon of the Council of Cressy (676).

In the outward progress of the Church the most important steps were those of *mission work in the British isles*. Augustin, with Laurentius and other Benedictine monks sent by Gregory I. to the Anglo-Saxons, landed on the coast of Kent in 597. Their success proved to be great beyond expectation. The king of Kent soon professed himself a Christian, and was followed by his people, ten thousand of whom were baptized in one day. Canterbury was constituted an archbishopric, and Augustin its first incumbent, in 604. At the end of five years he was succeeded by his companion, Laurentius, and the work went on prosperously.

The latter years of the sixth century and of the seventh were marked by great missionary zeal on the part of British Christians of the old connection. The Church in the South of Scotland was early cut off from Rome by the withdrawal of Roman troops farther south; subsequent interposition of heathen Saxons increased that isolation. About the year 430 the gospel was carried from Britain into the North of Ireland by Patricius (St. Patrick). His labors, commenced in counties Down and Armagh, soon extended to all the North, and thence, by the aid of others, the gospel was carried to the rest of the island. Armagh was subsequently constituted the seat of primacy for Ireland.

From about the middle of the sixth century the Irish clergy were distinguished for a learning superior to that of the age in other quarters and for missionary zeal. Their principal school and centre of operations was Bangor, in county Down.

About 563, Columba left Ireland to carry the gōspel into the North-west of Scotland, where it had not then been preached. With his twelve companions he was favorably received by a chief of the Hebrides, who gave him the island of Iona. There he erected a church and a house for himself and his missionaries who from that centre extended their labors to the conversion of the whole Pictish nation.

In 635, Oswald, the Saxon king of Northumbria, obtained a missionary from Iona to preach within his dominions, and gave him for residence the island of Lindisfarne. The progress of that mission was rapid, even to the centre of England. At the same time, the Romish missions from the South were advancing northward. In the conflict of authorities which ensued the power of Iona could not withstand that of Rome. Before the end of the seventh century the churches of Northumbria were comprehended within the jurisdiction of Rome. Lindisfarne became a Romish monastery, and its episcopal authority was transferred to Durham. York was the seat of an archbishopric, but Canterbury was honored with the primacy of all England.

It was also in the early part of the seventh century that Columbanus and Gallus left Ireland at the head of a little group of missionaries to preach in Burgundy, France and Switzerland. Columbanus died in 615; Gallus, in 627.

CHRONOLOGY FROM A. D. 752 TO 880.

Revival of the Western Empire.	Emperors of the East.	Popes.	Patriarchs of Constantinople.	Patriarchs of Jerusalem.
Decline of the Merovingian dynasty of Frankish kings. Pepin, son of Charles Martel, usurps the throne, 751	775 Leo IV., Constantine VI. with Irene, 797 Irene alone, deposed 802	752 Stephen III., 757 Paul I., 766 Stephen IV., 771 Adrian I., 795 Leo III., 816 Stephen V., 817 Paschal I., 824 Eugenius II., 827 Valentinus, 827 Gregory IV., 844 Sergius II., 847 Leo IV., 855 Benedict III., 858 Nicholas I., 867 Adrian II., 872 John VIII.,	754 Constantine II., 766 Nicetas I., 780 Paul IV., deposed 784 Tarsasius, 806 806 Nicephorus, deposed 815 Theodorus, 821 821 Antonius I., 832 John VII., expelled 842 Methodius, 846 846 Ignatius, deposed 857 Photius, deposed 867 Ignatius, restored 877 Photius, restored. Again deposed, 886	754 Theodore. Eusebius. 785 Elias II. George. 807 Thomas. 829 Basil. 843 Sergius II. 858 Salomon. 862(3) Theodore. 879 Elias III.
Succeeded by his sons Charles and Carloman, 768	802 Nicephorus, 811 Stauracius, 811 Michael I., 813 Leo V., 820 Michael II., 829 Theophilus, 842 Michael III., 867 Basil,	795 Leo III., 816 Stephen V., 817 Paschal I., 824 Eugenius II., 827 Valentinus, 827 Gregory IV., 844 Sergius II., 847 Leo IV., 855 Benedict III., 858 Nicholas I., 867 Adrian II., 872 John VIII.,	754 Constantine II., 766 Nicetas I., 780 Paul IV., deposed 784 Tarsasius, 806 806 Nicephorus, deposed 815 Theodorus, 821 821 Antonius I., 832 John VII., expelled 842 Methodius, 846 846 Ignatius, deposed 857 Photius, deposed 867 Ignatius, restored 877 Photius, restored. Again deposed, 886	754 Theodore. Eusebius. 785 Elias II. George. 807 Thomas. 829 Basil. 843 Sergius II. 858 Salomon. 862(3) Theodore. 879 Elias III.
Charles the Great = Charlemagne alone, 772	811 Michael I., 813 Leo V., 820 Michael II., 829 Theophilus, 842 Michael III., 867 Basil,	795 Leo III., 816 Stephen V., 817 Paschal I., 824 Eugenius II., 827 Valentinus, 827 Gregory IV., 844 Sergius II., 847 Leo IV., 855 Benedict III., 858 Nicholas I., 867 Adrian II., 872 John VIII.,	754 Constantine II., 766 Nicetas I., 780 Paul IV., deposed 784 Tarsasius, 806 806 Nicephorus, deposed 815 Theodorus, 821 821 Antonius I., 832 John VII., expelled 842 Methodius, 846 846 Ignatius, deposed 857 Photius, deposed 867 Ignatius, restored 877 Photius, restored. Again deposed, 886	754 Theodore. Eusebius. 785 Elias II. George. 807 Thomas. 829 Basil. 843 Sergius II. 858 Salomon. 862(3) Theodore. 879 Elias III.
Charlemagne crowned emperor of the West, 800	813 Leo V., 820 Michael II., 829 Theophilus, 842 Michael III., 867 Basil,	795 Leo III., 816 Stephen V., 817 Paschal I., 824 Eugenius II., 827 Valentinus, 827 Gregory IV., 844 Sergius II., 847 Leo IV., 855 Benedict III., 858 Nicholas I., 867 Adrian II., 872 John VIII.,	754 Constantine II., 766 Nicetas I., 780 Paul IV., deposed 784 Tarsasius, 806 806 Nicephorus, deposed 815 Theodorus, 821 821 Antonius I., 832 John VII., expelled 842 Methodius, 846 846 Ignatius, deposed 857 Photius, deposed 867 Ignatius, restored 877 Photius, restored. Again deposed, 886	754 Theodore. Eusebius. 785 Elias II. George. 807 Thomas. 829 Basil. 843 Sergius II. 858 Salomon. 862(3) Theodore. 879 Elias III.
814 Louis, 840 Lothaire, 855 Louis II., 875 Charles the Bald, 884 Charles the Fat, 888 Arnulf.	813 Leo V., 820 Michael II., 829 Theophilus, 842 Michael III., 867 Basil,	795 Leo III., 816 Stephen V., 817 Paschal I., 824 Eugenius II., 827 Valentinus, 827 Gregory IV., 844 Sergius II., 847 Leo IV., 855 Benedict III., 858 Nicholas I., 867 Adrian II., 872 John VIII.,	754 Constantine II., 766 Nicetas I., 780 Paul IV., deposed 784 Tarsasius, 806 806 Nicephorus, deposed 815 Theodorus, 821 821 Antonius I., 832 John VII., expelled 842 Methodius, 846 846 Ignatius, deposed 857 Photius, deposed 867 Ignatius, restored 877 Photius, restored. Again deposed, 886	754 Theodore. Eusebius. 785 Elias II. George. 807 Thomas. 829 Basil. 843 Sergius II. 858 Salomon. 862(3) Theodore. 879 Elias III.

CHAPTER V.

EARLY PAPAL SUCCESS.—ORGANIZATION OF THE NATIONAL CHURCHES OF THE WEST.

(752-880.)

LEAGUED with the great Carolingian kings of France, the papacy now entered upon the first period of its real supremacy in the West. That period extends from the pontificate of Stephen II. until 880, the date of the difference (never reconciled) between the patriarchs of Constantinople and Rome and the beginning of the mediæval decline of the papacy. Another feature of the time was the settlement of the new nations, the chief work of Charlemagne, who also forced upon his heathen subjects the profession of Christianity by having them baptized.

By the beginning of the seventh century *the worship of images* had become common throughout the Church, both east and west. Though still far from meeting the approval of all the scripturally-instructed clergy, the mass of the people, and a sufficiently great number of the clergy to sustain them, were devotedly attached to the practice. How was the evil to be remedied? The great hierarchs of the Church were in favor of it. The duty seemed to fall upon the emperor. So thought Leo Isauricus, who in 726 issued an edict forbidding the images to be worshiped. That not having the

effect intended, four years afterward (730) he ordered all images in churches to be removed or destroyed. The opposition of Germanus, patriarch of Constantinople, was overcome by deposing him and setting up Anastasius. Rome defended image-worship, and Catholic Christians under Mohammedan rule adhered to it as a distinctive badge of their religion.

The course of the emperor Leo was also pursued by his successor, Constantine V., in whose reign the council of 754, at Constantinople, condemned the worship of images, but not to the satisfaction of the Catholic public nor of the bishop of Rome, who rejected the council. A new stage of the controversy opened, the imperial authority being generally arrayed against images and the popes in favor of them, until, in the minority of the emperor-Constantine VI., his mother, Irene, became (in 780) empress-regent and sustained the cause of the image-worshippers. Irene called a General Council to meet at Nice in 787, which with her support declared image-worship to be orthodox and defined and prescribed the practice. That council is accepted by both Eastern and Western Catholic churches, and its decision is their authority on the subject.

The controversy was opened a third time by the emperor Leo V., who in 815 called a council at Constantinople, in which image-worship was condemned. But finally, when the empress Theodora came into power, a fourth council, convoked at Constantinople in 842, sustained the image-worshippers, confirming the Second Council of Nice. The controversy closed with a grand festival—called “the festival of orthodoxy”—in honor of that decision.

Transubstantiation of the elements in the Eucharist was first formally taught and defended by Paschasius Radbert, abbot of Corbey from 844 to 851. Though practically held by very many in the Church from earlier time, it encountered opposition when first proposed as a dogma, and was not accepted authoritatively, nor was the term "transubstantiation" introduced, until long afterward. Rabanus Maurus and Ratramnus, the ablest theologians of the ninth century, wrote against it.

A difference of opinion concerning the *procession of the Holy Spirit* had more immediate effect upon the history of the Church. The Creed of the General Councils states that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father. The persuasion that he proceeds from both the Father and the Son prevailed among the Western theologians, and some time in the early part of the ninth century was introduced into the Latin version of the Creed. The proposal to insert it in the original Greek was rejected by the Council of Constantinople in 879. On that subject the Eastern and Western Catholic churches established a permanent difference of opinion.

About the middle of the seventh century a sect of reformers arose in the East who sought to conform closely to the teachings of the apostles, especially of John and Paul. From their frequent use of the name and writings of the latter, it is most commonly thought, they were called *Paulicians*. Persecution from Constantinople raged against them—bitter, long continued and repeated; yet through the eighth century they increased in number and spread extensively in Asia Minor. Persecution, relaxed under Nicephorus (802—

811), was afterward revived and continued long, most severely under the rule of the zealous image-worshiper Theodora, who with a fanatical fury resolved on nothing short of extermination. A hundred thousand Paulicians were slain by her officers, according to the testimony of the guilty party. Many fled for refuge to the Saracens, and, finding protection, added their force to the enemies of the empire. But, notwithstanding the severity of those persecutions, their converts increased also to the westward, and Paulician churches were founded in Thrace and Bulgaria, and thence, at a later period, disseminated their doctrines, under various names, into the West of Europe.

The last years of the eighth century and the earlier part of the ninth were marked by a highly zealous effort at reform and *restoration of learning*, made by both Christian and Mohammedan princes.

Among the Saracens it was the time of the great Abbasside kalifs of Bagdad, a dynasty elevated in 750, at Damascus, by the cruel success of Abul Abbas, called Al Saffah. Their seat of government was subsequently removed to Hashemiah, and in 762 to Bagdad. Al Mansur and Al Mahadi successively reigned after Abul Abbas until 785, when the kaliphate reached its highest excellence under Harun Al Raschid. Upon his death, in 808, his sons Al Amin and Al Mamun and Al Motassem reigned successively until 841. From that date Bagdad began to decline, and succeeding barbaric invasions rendered decline irremediable.

In Spain the Moors within this period began their career of civilization, which they continued until the rise of modern learning.

In the Greek empire the state of culture was little improved, yet one or two authors flourished there greatly superior to any of the foregoing period, conspicuous among whom was the patriarch Photius.

In the West of Christian Europe the effort toward restoration of learning and of ecclesiastical order was earnestly made by those at the head of the civil government—Pepin, Charlemagne and Louis—from 751 to 840. For the time then being their success was not equal to that of the Mohammedan princes, but the seeds they planted bore more abundant fruit in a far-distant future. The sons of Louis divided their father's dominion and enfeebled their resources, but they also patronized letters to some degree. With the death of Charles the Bald, in 877, such patronage ceased in that quarter; but almost at the same time commenced the reign of Alfred the Great in England, extending from 871 until 900.

With all the encouragement of Charlemagne, the improvement in learning was very slender. Few cared to study, and the course of instruction, even in the improved schools, was scanty. The topics of the *Trivium* and *Quadrivium* were briefly and superficially treated. Among the scholars who illustrate the time were Alcuinus, Eginhard, Rabanus Maurus, Hincmar, Ratramnus, John Scot Erigena and Claudius of Turin.

The wars of Charlemagne, extending through thirty years, resulted in establishing his dominions from the Ebro and the South of Italy to the Elbe and the Eider in the North, and from the Atlantic to the Valley of the Theis in Hungary.

Pope Leo III., seeing all this, resolved to break off the last show of allegiance to Constantinople and connect his office, on different terms, with the new monarchy, by reviving the Western empire. On the 25th of December, 800, Charlemagne was at Rome, in the church of St. Peter. When kneeling at the altar, he was approached solemnly by the pope, who placed on his head a golden crown and pronounced him emperor, while from the vast assembly burst forth the exclamation, "Life and victory to Charles, crowned by God emperor of Rome!" There was now again *an emperor of the West*, and Rome and the papacy were finally separated from the rulers of the East and from the Byzantine system of church government.

Subjects of dispute between the patriarch of Constantinople and the pope continued to accumulate during the ninth century. A council at Constantinople in 879 labored to reconcile them, but without effect, because it could not recognize Rome as the last court of appeal, nor assent to the Western doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit, nor to the claim of ecclesiastical jurisdiction over Bulgaria, Illyricum, Macedonia, Epirus, Thessaly, Achaia and Sicily. Consequently, the council of 879 was next year anathematized by Pope John VIII.

The bishops of the East and West never again met in a General Council of both churches. The Eastern Catholic Church recognizes no council as general since that of 879.

With the reign of Charlemagne begins the true settlement of the nations of Western Europe, and the period of dissolution comes to an end. In the consti-

tution of his empire, Charlemagne had special regard to the interests of the Church. That of Rome was the model which he endeavored to follow, but without admitting its supremacy. The highest authority in affairs of government was retained for the monarch. In the administration of law bishops and counts were associated and instructed to support each other. Neither Pepin nor Charlemagne, though paying great honor to popes, ever allowed them any other influence in affairs of state than that of advice or remonstrance. Thus the Gallican Church obtained, in its reconstruction under those great princes, a degree of freedom which no other Western Church could claim. In the reign of Louis papal influence was suffered to increase, and every advantage was taken by the popes of the division and enfeebling of the empire by his sons.

The Anglo-Saxon Church of Britain was most faithfully attached to Rome. It had no antiquity of greater purity to regret. In Spain, Christians living under Moorish rule were allowed the privileges of worship and of internal church government and discipline, but suffered in many ways from the Mohammedan populace. Gothic Spaniards were independent, and almost continually at war with the Moors.

Mission work was confined chiefly to the North of Europe. That of Anschar, commenced in 826, carried Christianity into Denmark and Sweden and laid the foundation for the archbishopric of Hamburg-Bremen, which was constituted in 831. What Anschar and his companions were to the North-west of Europe, Cyril and Methodius were to the North-east. Through their efforts the Moravians were added to the Eastern

Church about the year 862, the Bulgarians about 864, and in subsequent years the same labors were extended to the Chazars, a people living to the north of the Black Sea. From Moravia the cause was carried in 871 into Bohemia.

The discipline of the Church had undergone a change. Private confession was now completely established, and the priest was empowered to grant absolution under condition of a penance to be performed. Excommunication was not often inflicted, but from the civil forfeitures and the social exclusion connected with it had become intensified in its terrors.

Superstitious rites and observances were greatly multiplied. Saints, their images and relics increased on all hands, and legends of their virtues and miracles, manufactured chiefly in the East and at Rome, were greedily accepted by an ignorant public. A festival was introduced in honor of the birth of the Virgin Mary, September 8, and for her assumption, August 15. It had now been decided that Mary was taken up bodily to heaven. Every country, almost every family, had its patron saint.

In the growth of the papacy in the ninth century, above all that it had previously been, attempts were made to fortify the ground taken and construct the weapons for conquering more by the fabrication of suitable authorities. Certain canons of councils unheard of before and forged epistles of early popes were inserted into the collection of ecclesiastical laws which went under the name of "the Decretals of Isidore of Seville." They tended to make the clergy independent of the state, with the Roman see the centre of

their system. They were used as law from the time of Pope Nicholas I., or about 860, until the admission of their falsity, in the eighteenth century. Another similar forgery which came into operation within the same period was the pretended donation by Constantine I. of his Lateran palace and imperial authority in the West to the pope, whereby the papacy endeavored to sustain its assumption of a rank above all civil potentates and powers. This also continued to be adduced as legal authority until exposed by modern criticism. Not fabricated by popes, as far as known, but by some persons in the interest of the papacy, those productions were used to sustain papal claims for more than seven hundred years.

Amidst accumulating errors and corruptions there were still numerous examples of pastoral fidelity and of true Christian life among both clergy and laity. Thus honorably distinguished were Agobard, bishop of Lyons, in the reign of Louis the Pious, and Claudius, bishop of Turin, who contended earnestly for the simplicity of Christian faith, in opposition to the sensuous and idolatrous practices of the age.

CHRONOLOGY FROM A. D. 880 TO 1054.

Western Emperors.		Eastern Emperors.		Popes.		Patriarchs of Constantinople.		Patriarchs of Jerusalem.	
888 Arnulf.		886 Leo V.,	911	882 Martin I.,	884	886 Stephen.	893	879 Elias III.	
Empire becomes German.				883 Adrian II.,	885	893 Antonius II.,	893		
900 Louis III.,	912			891 Stephen VI.,	891	895 Nicholas I., deposed	905	879 Sergius II.	
912 Conrad.	918			891 Formosus.	891				
				895 Boniface VI.,	895				
				897 Stephen VII.,	897				
919 Henry the Fowler,	925			898 Romanus II.,	898				
				898 Theodore II.,	898				
				898 John IX.,	900				
				898 Leo V.,	900				
				900 Leo VI.,	903				
				903 Christopher.	903				
		911 Alexander.	919	904 Sergius III.,	911	906 Euthymius I.,	911		
		Constantine VII.,		911 Anastasius II.,	911	911 Nicholas I., restored	911		
				913 Landus.	914				
				915 Leo X.,	914				
		919 Romanus I., usurpation.		915 Stephen VIII.,	914				
				917 John XI.,	914				
				917 Leo XI.,	914				
				917 Stephen IX.,	914				
				917 Martin II.,	914				
				917 Agapetus II.,	914				
				917 John XII.,	914				
				917 Benedict V.,	914				
				917 John XIII.,	914				
				917 Benedict VI.,	914				
		945 Constantine VII.,	959	917 Domnus II.,	914				
		restored		917 Benedict VII.,	914				
				917 John XI.,	914				
		999 Romanus II.,	963	917 John XII.,	914				
				917 John XIII.,	914				
		963 Nicephorus II.,	969	917 John XIV.,	914				
				917 John XV.,	914				
				917 John XVI.,	914				
		969 John Zimisce,	976	917 Gregory V.,	914				
				917 John XVII.,	914				
				917 John XVIII.,	914				
				917 John XIX.,	914				
		976 Basil II.,	1003	917 Sylvester II.,	914				
				917 John XX.,	914				
				917 John XXI.,	914				
				917 John XXII.,	914				
				917 John XXIII.,	914				
				917 John XXIV.,	914				
				917 John XXV.,	914				
				917 John XXVI.,	914				
				917 John XXVII.,	914				
				917 John XXVIII.,	914				
				917 John XXIX.,	914				
				917 John XXX.,	914				
				917 John XXXI.,	914				
				917 John XXXII.,	914				
				917 John XXXIII.,	914				
				917 John XXXIV.,	914				
				917 John XXXV.,	914				
				917 John XXXVI.,	914				
				917 John XXXVII.,	914				
				917 John XXXVIII.,	914				
				917 John XXXIX.,	914				
				917 John XL.,	914				
				917 John XLI.,	914				
				917 John XLII.,	914				
				917 John XLIII.,	914				
				917 John XLIV.,	914				
				917 John XLV.,	914				
				917 John XLVI.,	914				
				917 John XLVII.,	914				
				917 John XLVIII.,	914				
				917 John XLIX.,	914				
				917 John L.,	914				
				917 John LI.,	914				
				917 John LII.,	914				
				917 John LIII.,	914				
				917 John LIV.,	914				
				917 John LV.,	914				
				917 John LVI.,	914				
				917 John LVII.,	914				
				917 John LVIII.,	914				
				917 John LIX.,	914				
				917 John LX.,	914				
				917 John LXI.,	914				
				917 John LXII.,	914				
				917 John LXIII.,	914				
				917 John LXIV.,	914				
				917 John LXV.,	914				
				917 John LXVI.,	914				
				917 John LXVII.,	914				
				917 John LXVIII.,	914				
				917 John LXIX.,	914				
				917 John LXX.,	914				
				917 John LXXI.,	914				
				917 John LXXII.,	914				
				917 John LXXIII.,	914				
				917 John LXXIV.,	914				
				917 John LXXV.,	914				
				917 John LXXVI.,	914				
				917 John LXXVII.,	914				
				917 John LXXVIII.,	914				
				917 John LXXIX.,	914				
				917 John LXXX.,	914				
				917 John LXXXI.,	914				
				917 John LXXXII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXIII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXIV.,	914				
				917 John LXXXV.,	914				
				917 John LXXXVI.,	914				
				917 John LXXXVII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXVIII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXIX.,	914				
				917 John LXXXX.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXI.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXIII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXIV.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXV.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXVI.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXVII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXVIII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXIX.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXX.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXI.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXIII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXIV.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXV.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXVI.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXVII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXVIII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXIX.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXX.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXI.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXIII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXIV.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXV.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXVI.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXVII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXVIII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXIX.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXX.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXXI.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXIII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXIV.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXV.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXVI.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXVII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXVIII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXIX.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXX.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXXI.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXIII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXIV.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXV.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXVI.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXVII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXVIII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXIX.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXX.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXXI.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXIII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXIV.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXV.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXVI.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXVII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXVIII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXIX.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXX.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXXI.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXIII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXIV.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXV.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXVI.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXVII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXVIII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXIX.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXX.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXXI.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXIII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXIV.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXV.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXVI.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXVII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXVIII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXIX.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXX.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXXI.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXIII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXIV.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXV.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXVI.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXVII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXVIII.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXIX.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXX.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXXI.,	914				
				917 John LXXXXXXII.,	914				
				9					

CHAPTER VI.

PAPAL DEGENERACY AND REFORM.

(880-1054.)

IN the pontificate of John VIII. the papacy had reached the prime of its early success, having succeeded in gathering together in itself all the elements of Romanism. By the same time a long succession of emperors and patriarchs in Constantinople had matured the system of Byzantinism. Some points on which the pope and the patriarch differed in 879 and 880 were such as could not be compromised. Still, they continued for one hundred and seventy-four years to hold relations to each other as ministers in the Catholic Church, although in a state of bitter rivalry, until in the year 1054 they separated entirely, rending the Catholic Church in two. The intervening period is the lowest in the history of civilized Europe. It is marked by papal degeneracy, by the decline of the Western empire and its revival as German, and by the darkest shades of popular ignorance.

From the death of Charles the Bald, in 877, the Carolingian dynasty broke down. The German branch of it became extinct in 912. Conrad of Franconia was elected emperor, and after his death, in 918, Henry the Fowler, of Saxony. Under that dynasty the

Western empire, as a German power, entered upon a new career of prosperity, in which it was carried forward chiefly by Otho I. between 936 and 973. In 1024 it passed again into the house of Franconia, beginning with Conrad II., followed successively by Henry III. and Henry IV., who commenced his eventful career as a child of six years old, under the regency of his mother.

Pope John VIII. died in 882, and was followed for nearly a hundred and seventy years by a series of popes of whom, with only two or three exceptions, it is fair to say that, whatever their abilities might be, these were less conspicuous than their vices. The papal office became an object of political ambition for which the elections were managed by parties among the Italian nobles. From about 898, if not earlier, the principal power was wielded by certain infamous women of high rank, and by their descendants and kindred, for a hundred years. In the early part of the eleventh century Rome, both ecclesiastical and civil, was under the domination of the house of Tusculum, a branch of the flagitious stock to which it had been subject in the tenth century. So low had the papacy descended that men were put into it without the pretence of being clergymen. John XIX., a layman and a brother of the count of Tusculum, was carried to the papal chair in 1024, if not by purchase, at least by the political management of his family. He was succeeded in 1033 by his nephew, Benedict IX., for whom the papal office had been purchased when he was but a boy of ten years. The dissolute life of Benedict matched the scandalous manner of his election. Rome endured

him ten years, and then, in 1044, drove him from the city and set up Sylvester III. In the course of the strife which ensued Tusculum prevailed, and restored Benedict. Sylvester, under excommunication, betook himself to flight. But the violence of parties did not cease. Benedict concluded to sell his office; it was purchased in 1046 by John Gratian, a priest, who took the papal name "Gregory VI." Subsequently, Benedict changed his mind; his party again rallied around him, and enthroned him once more in the Lateran palace. One of his rivals, Gregory, held his place in the cathedral of St. Maria Maggiore, while the other, Sylvester, retained St. Peter's and the Vatican. The streets of Rome were harassed by the deadly strife of their partisans.

The emperor Henry III. came from Germany to restore order, and advanced to Sutri, where he called a council. All three popes were cited to appear. Benedict abdicated, the other two were deposed, and a new pope was elected from the German clergy, who took the name "Clement II." Henry then marched to Rome and inducted his pope into the papal throne with the apparent consent of the Roman clergy, and received for himself and his queen imperial coronation at his hands.

Clement's attempt to reduce the irregularities of bishops and other clergy failed. Owing to the gigantic extent of the evils, his council called at Rome could accomplish nothing. He died within a year. Benedict IX. took occasion of the absence of any higher authority to renew his usurpation once more, and maintained it nine months. Application was made to the

emperor to nominate a pope according to his own judgment. He sent them Poppo, bishop of Brescia, who reigned, as Damasus II., only twenty-three days. Again the vacant chair awaited the emperor's nomination; he appointed his kinsman Bruno, bishop of Toul, a man of learning and humble piety. In a great assembly at Worms, in presence of the delegates from Rome, the emperor had him invested with the badges of pontifical office. Thus the papacy, through necessities imposed by its own corruptions, was coming distinctly under control of the secular power; so loosely had the elections been latterly conducted that the secular power was needed to give them some regularity.

It was at that juncture that one of the most extraordinary characters of the Middle Ages appeared. The newly-elected pope was encountered at Besançon, on his way to Italy, by a young monk from Cluny who was destined to wield a more than imperial influence over him. Hildebrand was a native of Tuscany, born about 1020, educated in Rome, and afterward in Cluny. His education was entirely monastic, and his ideas of papal reform were drawn from the monastery. About the age of twenty-four he returned to Rome, at the juncture when the strife between rival popes was the fiercest, and attached himself to Gregory VI. When all three popes were deposed, Hildebrand followed Gregory into retirement, and after his death returned for a short time to Cluny. He had kept well informed of the course of events in Rome, and, now greatly dissatisfied with the act of investiture at Worms, he presented himself, in company with Hugh, abbot of Cluny,

to the pope-elect, and persuaded him to consider his investiture by imperial authority null. Bruno dismissed his papal equipage, and in company with Hildebrand pursued the rest of his journey in the manner of a pilgrim. At Rome he submitted to election by the clergy, and assumed the papal office, as Leo IX., upon purely ecclesiastical investiture.

Bishops very generally disapproved of papal intermeddling with the domestic affairs of their dioceses; from the latter part of the ninth century the false Decretals operated to bring them under that control. Another means was perhaps not less effective. The popes had long been in the habit of conferring archiepiscopal office by giving the pallium, or official robe, and from the time of Nicholas I. (858-867) that had been given only on condition of the receiver taking an oath of obedience to the Romish see. It was by the common people that in those days papal claims were supported. With a superstitious reverence, they conceived that the pope exercised the powers of divine law and were ready to submit to him rather than to any authority merely human.

The metropolitans, or archbishops of the West, gradually brought under papal dominion, were also connected in other relations with the civil government. In the temporalities of their sees they were involved in the generally-prevailing feudal system, their tenants being feudally dependent on them and they feudally related to the monarch. They had to take the oath of allegiance to him and to receive from him investiture in their estates and civil honors. It inevitably followed that numbers of ambitious persons obtained

high places in the Church through royal favor or political manoeuvring or by money. Inferior places, of course, went the same way; and *simony* became a prevailing vice of the clergy. The ministrations of the Church, conducted by such men, had ceased to contain instruction. Preaching in the parishes was almost obsolete. The service was in Latin, which was no longer spoken or understood by the people.

The monasteries, in which piety and intelligence did find some refuge, were always difficult to regulate. Houses on the system of Benedict, after many fluctuations, before the beginning of the tenth century, had all degenerated. Monks had become irregular, idle and dissolute. As a measure of reform—the only reform belonging to the tenth century—the convent of Cluny was founded in 910 by William of Aquitaine. The rules of Benedict were there revived and some were added, especially under the second abbot, Odo, who by strictness of discipline secured for his convent a reputation of eminent sanctity. After its example other monasteries were founded or reformed. Many persons who were not monks so connected themselves with them as to be allowed, according to the then prevailing ideas, a “share in the spiritual blessing of the brotherhood.” Cluny was assigned to the immediate care of the pope. In that respect, also, many other monasteries followed its example.

The reign of ignorance and superstition continued. God was concealed from the view of worshipers by a multitude of saints held up for adoration in his stead. The Virgin Mary was honored most of all. Saturday was set apart to her, and an office of divine service in-

troduced in her worship. The Lord Jesus Christ was not entirely left out of view, but, together with the other Persons of the Godhead, was put at a great distance off, unless when represented as a child or a corpse. Access to him as God was to be through his mother.

Penances were reduced to a system regulated by written rules; it was an act of great merit to exceed those rules by voluntary infliction. It was now practically admitted that pardon of sin could be granted by the priest upon confession to him and compliance with the penance imposed. Excommunication as a means of coercion had reached its extreme severity, and was carried to its widest application when laid upon a nation in the form of interdict.

A signal confession of judicial incapacity was implied in trial by ordeal—a heathen custom introduced from Germany, and now superintended by the clergy. Of similar nature was that of trial by battle, the evil effects of which have lasted longest. One institution of the time for which the clergy deserve credit was the “Truce of God,” an attempt to put some check, though only partial and brief, upon the prevalence of private wars. Popularly it was believed that all things were sinking toward dissolution, and that the world would come to an end in the year 1000 after Christ.

The very missionary enterprises of the time partook of its wild, half-heathenish character. In Norway, Christianity was established by force of arms. By the same means it obtained the mastery in Bohemia, and was forced upon the Wends by the German empire, upon the Hungarians by their kings, and upon

the Russians by their grand duke. That the gospel of Christ survived such extravagant misrepresentation is almost miraculous, and is due chiefly to the preservation of the written word and the fact that there was always a faithful remnant true to the spirit of its instructions.

In order to a just apprehension of the Church in the Middle Ages, it is important to distinguish, as Catholics do not, between the Church and the hierarchy, and in the hierarchy itself between the episcopal authorities and the papal.

In the same year in which Leo IX. died (1054) all intercourse between the Eastern and Western Catholic churches came to an end. A letter to a friend in Italy from the patriarch of Constantinople commenting on the errors and abuses of the West was responded to with great bitterness. Papal delegates were sent to Constantinople, who attempted to treat the patriarch as a subject of the pope. Their pretensions were not allowed. They laid an act of excommunication upon the great altar of St. Sophia, to which the patriarch responded in a similar spirit. And thus, on the 16th of July, 1054, the two great hierarchs parted for ever.

It was at the same juncture when the popes entirely separated from the Eastern Church that they began to adopt those measures of policy which eventuated in maturing the papal system, and in carrying it to a real domination over the West.

CHRONOLOGY FROM A. D. 1054 TO 1305—THE END OF THE WESTERN EMPIRE.

German Emperors.	Eastern Emperors.	Popes.	Latin hymns. Second stage of scholasticism. 1164-1308.	Crusades against the Albigenses. Rise of the Preaching orders.	Crusade of 1204. LATIN PATRIARCHS IN THE CRUSADE OF 1204.	Crusades against the Albigenses. Rise of the Preaching orders.	FIFTH CRUSADE, 1217-29.	SIXTH CRUSADE, 1260.	SEVENTH CRUSADE, 1267-71.	Thomas Aquinas d. 1274.	Vespers of Palermo, 1282.	End of the crusades, 1291.	Duns Scotus, 1304.	Removal to Avignon.
1054 Henry III.,	1054 Michael VI.,	Leo IX.,	1054											
1056 Stephen X.,	1057 Stephen X.,	Victor II.,	1057											
1059 Henry IV.,	1059 Isaac Comnenus,	Stephen X.,	1058											
	1059 Constantine Ducas,	Benedict X.,	1058											
	1068 Romanus Diogenes,	1059 Nicholas II.,	1061											
	1071 Michael VII.,	1071 Gregory VII.,	1065											
	1072 Ducas,	1072 Victor II.,	1065											
	1078 Nicophorus	1078 Urban II.,	1087											
	Batoniates,	1090 Pascal II.,	1118											
	1081 Alexius Comnenus,	1118 Gelasius II.,	1119											
	1118 John I.,	1119 Calixtus II.,	1124											
	1143 Manuel,	1119 Honorius II.,	1130											
	1180 Alexius II.,	1140 Innocent II.,	1143											
	1183 Andronicus,	1143 Celestine II.,	1144											
	1195 Isaac Angelus,	1144 Lucius II.,	1145											
	1195 Alexius III.,	1145 Eugenius III.,	1153											
	1195 Constantine	1146 Eugenius III.,	1153											
	1195 Alexius III.,	1146 Adrian IV.,	1159											
	1197 Philip.	1147 Urban III.,	1168											
	1204 Baldwin I.,	1147 Gregory VIII.,	1169											
	1210 Henry,	1148 Clement III.,	1181											
	1217 Peter of Courmay,	1148 Celestine III.,	1181											
	1220 Robert,	1149 Innocent III.,	1216											
	1228 Baldwin II.,	1149 Honorius III.,	1221											
		1149 Gregory IX.,	1241											
		1149 Celestine IV.,	1241											
		1149 Innocent IV.,	1261											
		1149 Alexander IV.,	1264											
		1149 Urban IV.,	1264											
		1149 Clement IV.,	1264											
		1149 Gregory X.,	1264											
		1149 Innocent V.,	1264											
		1149 Adrian V.,	1264											
		1149 John XXI.,	1264											
		1149 Martin IV.,	1264											
		1149 Honorius IV.,	1264											
		1149 Nicholas IV.,	1264											
		1149 Celestine V.,	1264											
		1149 Boniface VIII.,	1264											
		1149 Benedict XI.,	1264											
		1149 Clement V.,	1264											
		1149 Urban V.,	1264											
		1149 Gregory X.,	1264											
		1149 Innocent V.,	1264											
		1149 Adrian V.,	1264											
		1149 John XXI.,	1264											
		1149 Martin IV.,	1264											
		1149 Honorius IV.,	1264											
		1149 Nicholas IV.,	1264											
		1149 Celestine V.,	1264											
		1149 Boniface VIII.,	1264											
		1149 Benedict XI.,	1264											
		1149 Clement V.,	1264											
		1149 Urban V.,	1264											
		1149 Gregory X.,	1264											
		1149 Innocent V.,	1264											
		1149 Adrian V.,	1264											
		1149 John XXI.,	1264											
		1149 Martin IV.,	1264											
		1149 Honorius IV.,	1264											
		1149 Nicholas IV.,	1264											
		1149 Celestine V.,	1264											
		1149 Boniface VIII.,	1264											
		1149 Benedict XI.,	1264											
		1149 Clement V.,	1264											
		1149 Urban V.,	1264											
		1149 Gregory X.,	1264											
		1149 Innocent V.,	1264											
		1149 Adrian V.,	1264											
		1149 John XXI.,	1264											
		1149 Martin IV.,	1264											
		1149 Honorius IV.,	1264											
		1149 Nicholas IV.,	1264											
		1149 Celestine V.,	1264											
		1149 Boniface VIII.,	1264											
		1149 Benedict XI.,	1264											
		1149 Clement V.,	1264											
		1149 Urban V.,	1264											
		1149 Gregory X.,	1264											
		1149 Innocent V.,	1264											
		1149 Adrian V.,	1264											
		1149 John XXI.,	1264											
		1149 Martin IV.,	1264											
		1149 Honorius IV.,	1264											
		1149 Nicholas IV.,	1264											
		1149 Celestine V.,	1264											
		1149 Boniface VIII.,	1264											
		1149 Benedict XI.,	1264											
		1149 Clement V.,	1264											
		1149 Urban V.,	1264											
		1149 Gregory X.,	1264											
		1149 Innocent V.,	1264											
		1149 Adrian V.,	1264											
		1149 John XXI.,	1264											
		1149 Martin IV.,	1264											
		1149 Honorius IV.,	1264											
		1149 Nicholas IV.,	1264											
		1149 Celestine V.,	1264											
		1149 Boniface VIII.,	1264											
		1149 Benedict XI.,	1264											
		1149 Clement V.,	1264											
		1149 Urban V.,	1264											
		1149 Gregory X.,	1264											
		1149 Innocent V.,	1264											
		1149 Adrian V.,	1264											
		1149 John XXI.,	1264											
		1149 Martin IV.,	1264											
		1149 Honorius IV.,	1264											
		1149 Nicholas IV.,	1264											
		1149 Celestine V.,	1264											
		1149 Boniface VIII.,	1264											
		1149 Benedict XI.,	1264											
		1149 Clement V.,	1264											
		1149 Urban V.,	1264											
		1149 Gregory X.,	1264											
		1149 Innocent V.,	1264											
		1149 Adrian V.,	1264											
		1149 John XXI.,	1264											
		1149 Martin IV.,	1264											
		1149 Honorius IV.,	1264											
		1149 Nicholas IV.,	1264											
		1149 Celestine V.,	1264											
		1149 Boniface VIII.,	1264											
		1149 Benedict XI.,	1264											
		1149 Clement V.,	1264											
		1149 Urban V.,	1264											
		1149 Gregory X.,	1264											
		1149 Innocent V.,	1264											
		1149 Adrian V.,	1264											
		1149 John XXI.,	1264											
		1149 Martin IV.,	1264											
		1149 Honorius IV.,	1264											
		1149 Nicholas IV.,	1264											
		1149 Celestine V.,	1264											
		1149 Boniface VIII.,	1264											
		1149 Benedict XI.,	1264											
		1149 Clement V.,	1264											
		1149 Urban V.,	1264											
		1149 Gregory X.,	1264											
		1149 Innocent V.,	1264											
		1149 Adrian V.,	1264											
		1149 John XXI.,	1264											
		1149 Martin IV.,	1264											
		1149 Honorius IV.,	1264											
		1149 Nicholas IV.,	1264											
		1149 Celestine V.,	1264											
		1149 Boniface VIII.,	1264											
		1149 Benedict XI.,	1264											
		1149 Clement V.,	1264											
		1149 Urban V.,	1264											
		1149 Gregory X.,	1264											
		1149 Innocent V.,	1264											
		1149 Adrian V.,	1264											
		1149 John XXI.,	1264											

CHAPTER VII.

THE SUMMIT OF PAPAL PROSPERITY.

(1054-1303.)

UPON the death of Leo IX., Hildebrand first undertook to manage the papal elections. His policy was in the main successful until the quarrel of Boniface VIII. with the king of France, which issued in the removal of the papal residence to Avignon in 1305. The interval is a true historic period possessing features of its own found nowhere else.

First, it presents the maturity of the papacy, within which that system exercised the highest and widest authority it was ever permitted to wield. Secondly, it was the time of controversy between the German emperors and the popes. A third feature was the scholastic theology; a fourth, the crusades; and a fifth, the general quickening of intellect, as manifested in the increase of dissenting religious sects, incipency of popular song and rise and progress of schools and universities.

During the pontificate of Leo IX., Hildebrand, now a cardinal subdeacon, improved every opportunity to increase his influence, and succeeded in putting himself at the head of a party seeking to correct ecclesiastical abuses long found incorrigible.

He had three objects in view—first, the removal of simony and lay interference in Church matters; second, to repress the immorality of the clergy; and third, to bind all the elements of the papacy into such a system as to realize the supremacy to which it aspired.

A grand conception—that of a dominion constructed by means of a perfectly organized hierarchy upon the basis of religion and morals, and subordinating to itself all the other powers and dignities of earth. It was not new; but Hildebrand recognized and retrieved its elements from the degradation to which they had been reduced in a long career of papal profligacy, and reconstructed them, under the most favorable circumstances, with the greatest effect. Execution of the design began with enforcing the celibacy of the clergy. Much to that end was done by Leo IX., but the pivot of the whole was in the papal elections, which Hildebrand never suffered to escape from his control. Under that judicious management four successive popes held office—Victor II., Stephen IX., Nicholas II. and Alexander II. In the reign of Nicholas II. a law was enacted ordaining that the pope should be elected from the cardinals and by the cardinals.

In 1056 the emperor Henry III. died, leaving as heir of his house a child under the regency of his mother. Soon afterward the reforming party secured the support of the Normans, who had recently taken possession of Naples and Sicily.

In 1073, after the death of Alexander II., the choice of the cardinals fell upon Hildebrand, who took the

name "Gregory VII." The young emperor Henry IV. was now on the throne. Pope Alexander had excommunicated some of the imperial counselors and demanded their removal from court, but they had been retained in favor. Hildebrand took up the cause and called upon the emperor to comply with the papal demand. Henry, at the first admonition, was engaged in war, and replied by a submissive letter. And so the matter rested for that time.

The policy of Gregory VII.—not declared all at once, but evinced in the course of his pontificate and abundantly stated in his epistles and succinctly epitomized in the *Dictatus Gregorii*—aimed at establishing the papacy supreme over all the powers and potentates of earth, ecclesiastical and civil, and arrogated for it the profession of homage by acts the most abject and degrading. But the office during the twenty years of his preceding counsels had gained immensely by the removal of moral corruption, by the systematizing of its business, by the dignified regularity of elections and frequent and consistent assertion of its sovereignty before a public well prepared to admit it. The subjection of the clergy, on the footing of celibacy and isolation from the common interests of society, had been, in the main, effected; the reformer was now prepared to enter upon the removal of simony and of lay interference in the Church. To achieve that he must begin with the source from which that widely ramified evil proceeded—at the court of the emperor and with the case of episcopal investiture. The emperor had failed to remove from his service his excommunicated counselors. Two years had elapsed.

At a synod in Rome (1075) it was decreed that if any person should accept a bishopric or an abbacy from the hands of a layman he should not be regarded as a bishop or an abbot, nor allowed to enter a church until he had given up the illegal claim; and all laymen, of whatever rank, who should bestow such investiture, were to be excluded from Church communion. Next year Gregory summoned the emperor to appear before him in Rome, on pain of anathema if he failed to obey. He did not obey, but called a council of German bishops at Worms, and had a sentence of deposition passed against the pope. Gregory forthwith issued his excommunication of the emperor, declaring him incompetent to reign any longer, and forbade his subjects to obey him. He also excommunicated the assembly at Worms. The subjects of the emperor were divided. The princes met at Tribur and appointed a council to meet at Augsburg to try the case; the pope was to preside and give decision. Meanwhile, Henry should be suspended from reigning until the excommunication was removed; and if that was not removed within a year, he should for ever be incapable of ruling.

Henry hurried into Italy and met the pope at Canossa, but obtained admittance to his presence only after a most humiliating penance of three days before the door of the castle. He obtained remission of his punishment, and then, once more emperor, thought of revenge for his humiliation..

The pope was now in danger. His party in Germany elected a new emperor, Rudolph of Suabia; war ensued, which lasted several years. The pope renewed

the excommunication; the emperor renewed his act of deposing the pope, and added to that the election of another pope, Clement III., whom he took to Rome and enthroned by force of arms. Meanwhile, Rudolph died; the full weight of the imperial arm now fell upon the pope, who found refuge among the Normans of Naples, and died at Salerno, May 25, 1085.

Pope Clement III. reigned in Rome, but the Gregorian party elected their own pope, Victor III., and when he died, in 1087, continued the succession by electing Urban II. For more than ten years the emperor retained his advantage, and the Gregorian party remained under depression until the enthusiasm of the first crusade swept everything before it. Of that movement, though Peter the Hermit was the preacher, Urban was the organizing power; on its tide he was carried to Rome in triumph. Military resources were withdrawn from the emperor by the irresistible attraction of the crusade. Clement ceased to be of any importance; he survived his rival a few months, but with such reduced support that no successor could take his place. The first crusade was the real triumph of Hildebrand.

Urban II. died July 29, 1099, under the splendor of victory, just fourteen days after the crusaders had entered Jerusalem. His successor, Pascal II., pursued the same policy. The emperor, reduced in resources, was persecuted with anathemas, his son encouraged to rebel against him and his subjects to revolt, until, broken down in health and spirit, he retired to private life, and died in poverty 1106.

The same year the controversy about investitures in England was settled by the pope giving his sanction to

the practice of churchmen holding benefices taking the oath of fealty to the king. The king of France also fell under papal excommunication, to which he submitted, and was absolved.

In the history of the papacy the twelfth and thirteenth centuries were occupied with a struggle to maintain that supremacy secured in the end of the eleventh. In some quarters it was held with great difficulty; in others it was increased. Sometimes the pope seemed on the verge of failure—for his supremacy over the state was even in its best days of precarious tenure—but some favorable event always turned up to restore him to his vantage-ground, and in the last emergency, perhaps, a crusade, in which he was always looked to by Western Europe as the head of Christendom. The question of investitures was settled with the empire (1122) by a compromise in which the monarch invested with the temporalities and the pope with the spiritual office, and symbols were chosen accordingly.

With the death of Henry V., in 1125, the imperial dynasty of Franconia came to an end. Lothair of Saxony was elected in the papal interest; during his reign the papacy enjoyed the full support of the civil power, but was divided by a schism within itself. Lothair III. died in 1137, and the new and more potent dynasty of the Hohenstaufen, the ducal line of Suabia, came to the throne in the person of Conrad III. In the interest of that imperial house a party was formed which received the name "Waibelingen," or "Ghibelline," opposed to the Guelphs, or Saxon party, which sustained the pope. For ages these two factions divided the politics of Italy and the empire.

Arnold of Brescia, a young priest, had come from the study of Scripture to the conviction that the clergy should hold no estate, but live upon the free-will offerings of the Church, and that priests of corrupt morals were by that fact no longer priests at all. Some of his views accorded with the efforts at that time made by some Italian cities to secure their independence, and were accepted very extensively. Arnold was condemned by the Lateran council of 1139, but his opinions prevailed with a great majority of the people in Rome. A revolution was contemplated, in which the temporal sovereignty of the pope was to be abolished and the ancient republican government restored. The insurgents occupied the Capitol; Pope Lucius II. was killed in the attempt to reduce them by force. His successor, Eugenius III., fled from the city and awaited some favorable turn of affairs. He had not long to wait.

The kingdom of Jerusalem, hard-pressed by the Saracens, who had taken the city of Edessa, was calling aloud to Europe for relief. By the preaching of Bernard of Clairvaux and others the crusading frenzy was aroused once more. A vast army was marched off to Palestine in 1147, under command of the emperor Conrad III. and King Louis VII. of France. Inferior interests lost their hold upon the public mind. The second crusade failed, but Eugenius, protected by the arms of Roger of Sicily, was restored to Rome. By the address of Adrian IV., who came to the papal chair in 1154, the Romans were induced to banish Arnold. The emperor Frederic Barbarossa marched an army into the North of Italy and reduced the Lom-

bard towns. Arnold was surrendered into his hands, and by him transferred to the pope. The pope hanged him, burned his body and cast the ashes into the Tiber.

It was Adrian IV. who in 1155 granted to Henry II. of England to conquer Ireland on the condition of annexing it to the Roman see. A few years later a papal attempt to make the clergy of England independent of the crown, to connect them more intimately with Rome, gave occasion to the meeting at Clarendon in 1164 which drew up the celebrated Clarendon Constitutions, one of the oldest documents lying at the basis of English freedom. The articles were sixteen, designed to limit papal aggressions and make the clergy amenable in some degree, like other men, to the laws of the land. A Becket, archbishop of Canterbury, and the whole body of the English clergy, gave assent to them, but, the articles being condemned by the pope, a Becket changed his mind and broke his pledge to his country for the favor of Rome. His subsequent conduct was that of rebellion against the king and support of papalism in England. It led to a controversy between the prelate and the king and the flight of a Becket to the Continent. A reconciliation took place, but after restoration a Becket returned to his former practices. Four English knights, hearing the king express himself angrily about the matter, went to Canterbury and slew a Becket while at service in church (1170). The king was blamed, and four years later was constrained to do penance at a Becket's tomb.

Within the twelfth century the free churches of Ire-

land and Scotland were brought under subjection to Rome—that of Scotland by its own Celto-Saxon dynasty between 1093 and 1153, and that of Ireland by the English conquest begun in 1171. In the next century (1283) the last stronghold of the old British independence in Wales was similarly reduced.

In 1183 the emperor Frederic Barbarossa made peace with the Lombards, secured the favor of the German clergy, and by the marriage of his son to the heiress of Sicily attached that wealthy island to his dynasty. The strength of the papal support was thereby diminished, while insurrection raged within the papal estates.

But again the papacy was saved by a crusade. Saladin had taken Jerusalem (1187), and all Europe was roused to a new effort for the recovery of the holy places. The emperor put himself at the head of it, May, 1189, marching by land; he lost his life on the march, and his army perished at the siege of Acre. Two other portions of the crusading host were led by Philip Augustus of France and Richard I. of England. With all the armies led out and prodigies of valor on the part of the crusaders, little was effected. Philip Augustus soon after the siege of Acre returned home, and Richard (Cœur de Lion), after taking Joppa and Askelon, learning that the king of France was projecting an invasion of England, concluded a peace of three years with Saladin and left Palestine in September, 1192.

Meanwhile, the pope had re-established his authority in Rome, and the death of the new emperor, Henry VI., removed the danger threatening from his posses-

sion of Sicily in right of his wife. The heir of the imperial house was a child only three years of age when the most successful of all popes began his pontificate. Henry VI. died September 28, 1197, and Innocent III. ascended the chair of the papacy on the 8th of January following.

Circumstances favored the new pope in a remarkable manner. Rome had been pacified. The death of the emperor gave occasion to a long-contested succession. The empress Constantia, heiress of Sicily, to secure that dominion for her son, accepted investiture from the pope, and on the eve of her death, which took place before the end of 1198, constituted him guardian of the infant prince, while both France and England were enfeebled by the crusade and by mutually-threatened war. No other pontiff realized to the same extent the Gregorian idea of the papacy. King John of England, who disregarded his mandate, was brought to submission by an interdict laid upon his kingdom, and was restored only upon accepting his crown as a gift of the pope and recognizing England as a province of the Roman see. This led to the meeting of the barons at Runnymede (1215) and the drawing up of the *Magna Charta*, which they compelled their unworthy king to grant as security against such alienation of themselves and their country.

Innocent III. also organized a crusade. It never reached Palestine, but besieged and took Constantinople in 1204 and set up there a Latin king, whereupon the pope asserted his jurisdiction in the Eastern empire, but without obtaining acknowledgment by the Greek Church.

The most successful crusade of Innocent III. was that against the Albigenses, a numerous dissenting sect in the South of France. Romish arguments failing to convince them, armies were marched into their country, which in successive years from 1209 covered it with slaughter and desolation.

In 1215, Innocent called a council in Rome—the Fourth Lateran, or, according to Romish reckoning, the Twelfth Œcumenical—at which various important questions pertaining to Romish doctrine and practice were authoritatively settled. At that point papalism reached the apex of its prosperity. Innocent died next year, but the power of the papacy remained through the reign of his successor, Honorius III.—that is, until 1227. The imperious temper of Gregory IX. renewed the vexatious quarrel with the empire, and, while successful, dragged into humiliation his own office.

The emperor Frederic II., son of Henry VI., was constrained to undertake a crusade. Because he delayed in carrying it out Gregory excommunicated him, and after he set out followed him with excommunications. Frederic was successful, recaptured Jerusalem and secured a treaty of peace for the Christians of Palestine for ten years, but on returning home found that he had to wage war with the pope.

From this time it was the papal purpose to break down the Suabian dynasty and secure the election of more compliant occupants of the imperial throne. Unrelentingly was that policy pursued until, after the early death of Frederic's successor, Conrad, in 1254, another minority and regency occurred. Advantage

was taken of that juncture to invite Charles of Anjou to assume possession of Sicily. The attempt of the young Conrad to defend his father's dominions failed, and the last heir of the Hohenstaufen, taken prisoner, perished on the scaffold (1268), and Charles of Anjou, brother of Louis IX. of France, became king of Sicily in the papal interest. Five years later the equally papal house of Hapsburg was elevated to the throne of the greatly-reduced empire in the person of Rudolph.

But already the long train of papal losses had begun. In 1261 the Greeks, under Michael Palæologus, recovered possession of Constantinople and expelled the Latin government. A subsequent attempt at the Council of Lyons (1274) to reunite the Greek and Roman Churches and establish papal jurisdiction in the East was agreed to by the Eastern emperor, but defeated by the refusal of the Greek Church to comply.

French rule in Sicily proved intensely unpopular. It was expelled by the insurrection called "the Sicilian Vespers," March 30, 1282, and the government put into the hands of the king of Aragon.

The seventh and last crusade to Palestine was led by Louis IX. of France and Prince Edward of England in 1270. Louis died at Tunis. Edward reached Palestine, but could only delay the fate of Acre by extorting a truce of three years. In 1291, Acre fell into the hands of the Mohammedans, and the prolonged contest was over.

The crusades were the wars of the papacy when its cause was identified with the interests of Christianity

in the West. Their termination was not only the loss of an effective weapon, but also a symptom of declining influence over the Christian public.

But a more serious calamity befell the papacy in the dispute which arose between Boniface VIII. and Philip the Fair, king of France. The king, on principles of civil law, resisted a papal mandate, and when the pope attempted to enforce it sent a commission into Italy which arrested him. The indignity so affected Boniface as to throw him into a fever, of which he died October 11, 1303. The next pontiff, Benedict XI., did not press the offensive demands. After his death King Philip succeeded in securing the election of a candidate who pledged to remain in France. Clement V. took up his residence at Avignon in 1305. The proudest days of the papacy were ended.

CHAPTER VIII.

SCHOLASTICISM.

WITH the schools founded and patronized by Charlemagne there were always connected some men of letters. During the tenth century and first half of the eleventh the series was very slender. Toward the middle of the eleventh century a little more literary effort began to appear. Then we read of Humbert, Peter Damiani, Lanfranc, Berengarius and Hildebrand (Pope Gregory VII.), in the course of whose lives we come to that class of writers called "schoolmen," or "scholastics," and who were at the same time the philosophers and theologians of the Middle Ages.

True *scholasticism* was a logical treatment of theology. Earlier Christian writers had drawn their philosophy chiefly from Plato; now the Platonic elements were comprehended in and subjected to Aristotelian methods, so far as the latter were known through the partial translation of Boëthius.

Augustinian theology was the recognized orthodoxy, but the practical teaching of the Church, which on some points had departed from that standard, proved more controlling. Some advanced doctrines which were censured as heretical, but in the main scholastics were the advocates of the Church as it then stood.

The history of that class of writers begins properly in the course of the controversy on the Eucharist, in the latter half of the eleventh century. At that date a zealous opponent of transubstantiation was Berengarius, scholastic—that is, superintendent—of the cathedral school in Tours. The subject was still an open question, so far as any adequate authority was concerned; it had been decided only by popular consent. Berengarius from about 1045 publicly denied transubstantiation, teaching that the bread and the wine in the Eucharist are external signs of Christ's body and blood. His argument was immediately controverted by several writers, who advocated the popular belief that in consecration by the priest the sacramental elements became the real body and blood of the Lord. Berengarius was condemned repeatedly by councils at Rome, Vercelli, Paris, Tours and elsewhere. Finally, at Rome, a definite statement of doctrine was prescribed for him to sign. He submitted, but afterward repented of the submission and held to his former doctrine. He died in 1088.

It was in this controversy that Lanfranc, prior of Bec, and subsequently archbishop of Canterbury, taking up the defence of transubstantiation, employed that subtlety of dialectics which was carried to greater length by a long array of writers who came after him. In the hands of Anselm, his immediate successor in Canterbury (1093–1109), it reached its early maturity, and perhaps its best.

The history of scholasticism divides itself into three periods.

The first, extending from the beginning of the con-

troversy with Berengarius until the death of Peter Lombard (1164), labored in lectures and controversial tracts. A new period opened in the very general adoption of Peter Lombard's *Book of Sentences* as a guide for lecturers, whereby scholasticism was turned to the systematic treatment of the whole body of theology. In that direction its highest results were reached in the works of Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus. With the death of the latter (1308) begins the period of scholastic decline, during which it was also gradually overmastered by the reviving classic and the growth of modern literature.

An inner controversy on philosophic ground early divided scholastics into two parties, as Realists and Nominalists. Nominalism soon fell under censure of the Church and gave place to a modification, which is better named "Conceptualism."

Another division, on the ground of faith, separated among them the Rationalist from the Mystic—as, for example, Abelard from Bernard—and from both a mediating party, as the theologians of St. Victor. In their later history they were divided also between Franciscan and Dominican monks.

The progress of scholasticism carried with it the improvement of the schools, which from the poor conventual instruction of the eleventh century was expanded until it blossomed into the universities of the thirteenth.

Scholastic freedom of speculation lay in treatment of points concerning which Scripture gives only indistinct hints and the Church had yet pronounced no positive dogma, but they also analyzed with apparent

freedom every doctrine of the Creed. Some ventured into a bolder freedom, which exposed them to heresy. David of Dinant and Amalric of Bena were by their methods of thinking led into pantheism and other philosophical errors.

On some points scholastic arguments prepared the way for the authoritative adoption as dogmas of what had previously been only optional beliefs; as in the case of works of supererogation, the number of the sacraments, definition of the doctrine of penance, and of priestly absolution and transubstantiation.

The more eminent scholastics carried forward philosophy, in its relations to theology, in a real progress beyond all that had ever been done before, profoundly weighing the philosophical import of doctrines; and although much trifling may be quoted from their later writers, yet to the labors of Abelard, of Bernard, of Peter Lombard, of Bonaventura, of Thomas Aquinas and others of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries we owe the first kindling of modern Europe to intellectual pursuits, the first scattering of light into the depths of mediæval darkness, the first philosophy which Western Europe could call her own, and the first classification in scientific form of Christian theology.

Some of the scholastics also opened the way to modern scientific investigation. Such were Albertus Magnus and Roger Bacon.

During the same period the principal part of the work was done for the canon law which conferred upon it the completeness of its form. About the middle of the twelfth century, the *Decretum* of Gratian issued from the celebrated law University of Bologna.

Subsequently, large collections from the decretals of later popes were added to it, under the names "Decretals" and "Extravagantes." And thus grew up the *corpus juris canonici*.

Various councils successively gave their sanction to elements of doctrine, discipline and worship which had previously grown up among the people and in ecclesiastical practice. Of those the most important was the Fourth Lateran, which confirmed the policy of Innocent III., established the practice of indulgence and the doctrine of works of supererogation, of confession to a priest as indispensable to obtaining pardon of sin, and of transubstantiation as belonging to the Creed of the Church, and the duty of exterminating heretics.

Meanwhile, the literature of the Greek Church continued in a depressed condition. Scholasticism was the fruit of reviving intellectual activity in the West—was itself a process of intellectual improvement; but no such process had yet begun in the East. The empire was still protracting its long decline, struggling for existence against Mohammedan aggression. The energies of the Greeks were crushed under the discouragements of their adverse fortunes. Several literary names of distinction appear among them, but none as connected with any original line of thought. Most worthy of mention were Theophylact, archbishop of Bulgaria (d. 1112), commentator on several books of Scripture; John Zonaras, one of the best Byzantine historians; and Eustachius, archbishop of Thessalonica (d. 1198), who, besides sermons, wrote a copious and valuable commentary on Homer.

Among the churches of the farther East were some

writers of distinction. Such were Eben Jesu (d. 1318), metropolitan of Nisibis, among the Nestorians; Nerses (d. 1173), among the Armenians; and Dionysius Bar Silibi, bishop of Amida (d. 1171), among the Monophysites; in which connection appears also the more illustrious name of Abulfarage (Bar Hebræus) (d. 1286), and that of George Elmacin, historian of the Saracens.

With the Jews this was a period of high scholarship, when Solomon Iarchi (d. 1105) of Troyes, Aben Ezra of Toledo (d. 1167), David Kimchi of Narbonne (d. about 1230), and Moses Ben Maimon, or Maimonides (d. 1205), of Cordova, labored in the interpretation of the Old Testament. It was also the flourishing period of that Arabic philosophy which had no little to do with the revival of philosophical studies in the Christian West. Avicenna died 1036, Al Gazali in 1227, and Averroes in 1217. Upon the whole, there was an extensive quickening of intellect in the direction of philosophy.

CHAPTER IX.

PREACHING AND MENDICANT ORDERS.

AMONG the monasteries irregularities again prevailed ; before the twelfth century had far advanced even Cluny itself had begun to degenerate. Great efforts were made to restore discipline, and to set up new monasteries with severer rules ; some of the orders were suppressed on account of their scandalous immorality. Still, the conviction prevailed that the proper way to correct those evils was to establish new orders on a better plan. Pope Innocent III., however, forbade the creation of any more orders, and the Lateran council of 1215 took action to the same effect. Notwithstanding, two other orders were sanctioned under his rule which proved of more influence in the Church and in the world than all the preceding had been.

The active apostolic piety and missionary labors of the poor Waldensian ministers, and the progress of dissenting opinions in the South of France and adjoining districts, arrested the attention and alarmed the fears of the Romish ecclesiastics. Dominic of Osuma, in Spain, and Francis of Assisi, in Italy, about the same time conceived similar plans for the conversion of those so-called heretics. Francis began in 1207 to assemble about him a body of men whom he solemnly laid under obligations to forego all earthly possessions,

enjoyments and knowledge and devote themselves solely to traveling and preaching the doctrines of Rome. They were to be called the *Ordo Fratrum Minorum*. As such they received the oral permission of Innocent III. in 1209, and were fully established by Honorius III. in 1223. After their domestic example an order of nuns was instituted, that of Santa Clara, with *regula* drawn up by Francis. He also organized an *Ordo tertius de Pœnitentia* for pious laymen, who, living in their own houses and enjoying their own property with their families, maintained a sort of spiritual union under a superior.

Dominic, who had been employed from 1205 in trying to convert the Albigenses by preaching, conceived a similar idea: it was that of an order which, unencumbered by property, should travel through that country preaching the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church. In 1215 the plan was proposed to Innocent III., who would grant it nothing more than his oral permission. But it was fully sanctioned next year by Honorius III., under the name of the *Ordo Predicatorum*. Monks of that order are more commonly called by the name of their founder, "Dominican," or from their garb, "Black Friars," as the order of Francis is generally called "Franciscan" or "Minorites" or "Gray Friars." The Dominicans also constituted tertiaries.

These were the principal mendicant orders by whom preaching, neglected in the parish churches, was supplied to the general public. Indirectly they conspired with the lecturers in the schools to promote the awakening spirit of inquiry, relatively doing for the populace

a work similar to what the lecturers were accomplishing in the schools. Ultimately they became also the lecturers, and occupied the most prominent places as scholastic writers. Departing in course of time from their original design, they departed also from the rule of poverty. On that subject the Franciscans divided; the stricter party, adhering to the rule, formed themselves into a separate order, which received the name "Fratricelli."

FREE ORDERS.

About the end of the twelfth century there sprang up in some towns in the Netherlands societies of women who, without monastic vows, lived together under rules of their own adoption and maintained themselves from their own property. They were called *Beguinae*. During the thirteenth century they increased in France and Germany, as well as in the Netherlands, to a great number.

Similar societies were also formed of men, and those who belonged to them were called *Bequini*, or *Beghards*. Latterly they connected themselves with the tertiary orders of the Franciscans and Dominicans.

Through the mendicant preaching orders and their tertiaries the cloister opened its doors to the world, and the voluntary societies added popularity to the movement.

The clergy claimed exemption from trial by civil tribunals, and the popes labored zealously to withdraw them altogether from secular jurisdiction; only ecclesiastical courts were held competent to try them, and from all tribunals they claimed the right of appeal to

the pope. In few countries were those claims fully realized.

From various causes great wealth came into the hands of ecclesiastics, leading to much conflict between the spiritual and the temporal authorities.

In the course of the twelfth century the Latin Church, in administering the Eucharist, gradually, in one place after another, adopted the practice of withholding the cup from the laity. Pope Pascal II. opposed the innovation and ordered that the bread and the wine should both be administered. After his time the opposite opinion gained ground. By the Greek Church the sacramental elements were mingled. The mysteries of the Greek Church correspond to the sacraments of the Roman, fixed to the number seven by that example—namely, Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Marriage, Penance, Orders and Extreme Unction—but they differ in their administration, and somewhat in their import.

CHAPTER X.

DISSENTING SECTS.

SIGNS of intellectual activity began to appear among the people as well as in the Church schools; they consisted chiefly in the rise of religious dissent and of an incipient popular literature.

Religious dissent may be classed under the heads of Paulicians, Cathari, Waldenses and independent orders.

The Paulicians, in their long persecution in the ninth century, were scattered to both East and West, beyond the bounds of the Greek empire. At the end of those sufferings a considerable number of them were found resident among the Slavic population on the Lower Danube. In the reign of Alexius Comnenus (1081-1118) the city of Philippopolis, in Thrace, was entirely under their influence. That emperor undertook to convert them, and removed his residence for a time to Philippopolis with that view, but all his authority, persuasives and violence failed. The sect maintained its ground within the empire, and about Philippopolis has its representatives still.

It is admitted that the Cathari—the Puritans—proceeded from the Slavonians of Bulgaria at least as early as the middle of the eleventh century, and had extended their societies to almost every country of

Europe before they were discovered by the hierarchy. From Bulgaria they spread into Thrace and became a large sect even in Constantinople, also into Dalmatia and Albania, where they were called "Albanenses." Westward they gained converts in large numbers as far as the Netherlands, England, France, Spain and Italy. In France they were frequently called the *Ordo Bulgarie*, or *Bulgari*, Gallicized into various abbreviations. In some places they were called *Poplicani*, *Patarini* or *Passagieri*. They divided the popular faith in Provence with the Waldenses. In Lombardy and Florence, in the States of the Church, in Calabria and Sicily, Catharian congregations existed for a long time, but it was in Lombardy and the South of France that they were strongest. The Albigenses are said to have been both Waldensian and Catharian.

Touching the origin of the Waldenses there is difference of opinion, but we know that they are mentioned as existing among the Alps in the twelfth century, and not as a new sect at that time. Their name is derived from their place of residence in certain valleys of the Cottian Alps, on the Italian side, about thirty miles in a south-west direction from Turin. By Catholic writers their doctrines were greatly misrepresented, but, more favored than most sects of that time, they survive to speak for themselves. They hold substantially the same views of Scripture truth as are held by evangelical Protestants.

Among dissenting orders we must include the stricter branch of the Franciscans, the Fraticelli, who opposed as firmly as any others the worldliness and luxury prevailing in the Church, and incurred as much persecu-

tion as the Beguines and the Beghards and the Apostolicals, and certain fanatical orders which were early suppressed.

METHODS FOR PREVENTING HERESY.

In order to complete the work of exterminating heretics—begun with such fearful scenes of bloodshed in the crusade against the Albigenses—and to organize a system whereby the Church should always eradicate the first appearance of heresy, it was made the business of the diocesan Synods to search out and punish every beginning of divergence from the faith of Rome. Every archbishop and every bishop was directed to visit, either personally or through some suitable agent, the parish of his diocese in which any heretics were reported to be, and to put under oath any of the inhabitants whom he chose to point out the suspected. Refusal to take the oath justified the suspicion of heresy. This first form of the Inquisition was the plan of Innocent III. and enacted as law by the Fourth Lateran Council (1215). An important change was made under Gregory IX., by the Council of Toulouse, in 1229, whereby the task was taken out of the hands of the bishops by the appointment of Dominican monks to be permanent inquisitors.

The Holy Scriptures were now forbidden to the laity. In the ancient Church their use was free to all, and to part with them was held by Christians as almost equivalent to denying their Saviour; but in the lapse of ages the Roman Church practice had departed so far from gospel precept that it was deemed expedient to withhold from the people the means of comparing them. That

step was first taken by the Greek Catholic Church in controversy with the Paulicians in the ninth century. In the West it was ordered by Innocent III. in 1199, and by the Council of Toulouse in 1229.

POPULAR LITERATURE.

It was in that belt of country consisting of Northern Italy, Southern France and the North of Spain that the modern languages of continental Europe were first trained to the service of letters. That early literature consisted chiefly of songs called "lays" and sung to the accompaniment of the harp, and those who composed them were Troubadours. The South of France was its centre, and its headquarters were the courts of the counts of Provence and Toulouse. The dialects throughout that belt of country were intimately related. From as early as the beginning of the eleventh century the Troubadour literature had been unfolding toward its proper maturity; the twelfth century was its meridian; and it was apparently about to issue in something greater, when it was abruptly terminated by the crusade against the Albigenses. A modification of it was patronized until a later date at the court of Aragon and by some of the kings of Castile and some of the princes in Northern Italy.

LATIN HYMNS.

The forms of that style of popular song were transferred to the Latin and used in the service of religion. Specimens of rhymed Latin verse can be adduced from earlier time, but the true history of rhymed Latin hymns begins with the eleventh century, and the best

of such productions belong to the twelfth and the thirteenth.

The latest lays of the Troubadours fell upon the youthful ear of Dante, who, deeply imbued with their lyrical spirit and versed in the Latin hymnology and philosophy of the schoolmen, concentrated the best literary fruits of all in his great poem the *Divina Commedia*, with which the history of modern literature began. Dante was in his prime when the papal court removed to Avignon.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE.

CHRONOLOGY FROM A. D. 1305 TO 1418.

German Empire.	Eastern Emperors.	Popes at Avignon.	Patriarchs of Constantinople.	Patriarchs of Jerusalem.
Albert of Austria, 1308	Andronicus II. Palaeologus, 1328	1305 Clement V., 1316 John XXII., 1334	1304 Athanasius, 1312 Niphon, 1316 John XII., 1320 Gerastinus, 1323 Issiah, 1333 John XIV., 1347 Isidore, 1349 Callistus I., 1354 Philotheus, 1355 Callistus restored, 1356 Macarius, 1376 Nitus, 1387 Antonius IV., 1387 Callistus II., 1396 Matthew I., 1410 Euthymius II., 1416 Joseph II. Died at Florence while attending the council in 1439.	The popes have continued, since the termination of the crusades, to name for Jerusalem titular Latin patriarchs without functions. The Greek Catholic Church has its real succession, but, from the condition of the see, of small importance in the general history of the Church.
1308 Henry of Luxemburg, 1313	1328 Andronicus III. Palaeologus, 1341	1334 Benedict XII., 1342 Clement VI., 1352 Innocent VI., 1362 Urban V., 1370 Gregory XI., 1378 Clement VII., 1394		
1314 Louis of Bavaria, 1347	1341 John V. Palaeologus, 1391			
1347 Charles IV., 1376				
1376 Wenceslaus, 1400				
1400 Rupert, 1410	1391 Manuel, 1424			
1411 Sigismund, 1437				
	Council of Pisa in 1409 elected Alexander V., 1410 1398 Boniface VIII. Succeeded in 1410 1404 Innocent VII. by John XXIII., 1406 Gregory XII. to 1409			
	Council of Constance deposes all three popes and elects Martin V., 1417.			

CHAPTER XI.

PAPAL DECLINE.—SUPERIORITY OF COUNCILS.—REVIVAL OF LEARNING.

(1303-1418.)

FROM the removal of the papal throne to Avignon to the close of the Council of Constance (1418) forms a distinct period in the history of the Church. It is marked by the declining and latterly divided state of the papacy; the growing freedom of dissent; the decline of dialectic scholasticism and the increase of mysticism; the magnifying of national hierarchy over the papal; the revival of classical learning and taste; and the rise of modern literature in the Italian, Spanish and English languages.

By reducing the German empire the popes had done much to liberate the cities of Northern Italy and to build up the growing monarchy of France. At the beginning of the fourteenth century France had no well-matched rival among the monarchies of the Continent whom the popes could array against it. At Avignon they were in no condition to assert their supremacy over it.

In 1347 another of those risings took place in Rome which have at several times aimed at restoring the glories of the ancient republic. By his eloquence and

enthusiasm Nicholas de Rienzi made himself tribune of the people, and governed the city for a few years. He was assassinated in 1354, and the whole fabric he had erected dissolved. But the States of the Church continued in a restless condition, and other causes were urgently calling for the papal restoration to Rome. England had recovered strength under the vigorous rule of Edward III., and declined payment of the required submission to the pope and of the tribute imposed by Innocent III. The pope's position in relation to France went to justify with the English public the acts of the party which questioned his right to interfere in their national affairs, and that party contained another, advocating also an ecclesiastical reform. After thirty-three years, in which the tribute had not been paid, Urban V. in 1365 made a demand upon the king for it, with all the arrears. Edward referred the question to his Parliament, which denied the validity of the papal claim. It had been imposed without the consent of Parliament, and was therefore unlawful. That action was defended by the learned ecclesiastic John of Wycliff. The victories of Edward III. and of his son the prince of Wales had reduced the French monarchy and stripped it of nearly half its dominions and of more than half its power. For a time England was the strongest power in Western Europe. The pope had purchased Avignon, but the condition of his estates in Italy seemed to demand his presence there.

Urban V. removed thither in 1367, but soon returned to Avignon. He died in 1370, and was succeeded by Gregory XI. Disorder in the States of the Church continued to increase. Gregory became fully

convinced that at all hazards he ought to return to Rome, which he did in 1377, but had to submit to open negotiations with his enemies. Peace was scarcely effected at his death, which occurred in 1378.

The cardinals were divided in opinion on the subject of returning from France. Urban VI. was elected pope on the 9th of April, 1378, by sixteen cardinals and took up his residence at Rome, but his intolerable temper and bearing soon alienated those who had been his friends. When they resisted him, he created twenty-six new cardinals to outvote them, whereupon all but one of those who had elected him, throwing themselves into the interest of the French party and withdrawing to Fondi, in the kingdom of Naples, elected Robert of Geneva on the 21st of September that same year. The new pope, as Clement VII., resided at Avignon, and was recognized by France, Spain, Scotland, Sicily and Cyprus; to Urban VI. adhered Italy, England, Bohemia and Hungary. In this case not only the papacy was divided, but also the Latin Church. At Avignon, Clement VII. was in 1394 followed by Benedict XIII., and at Rome, in 1389, Urban VI. by Boniface IX., until 1404. The interval to 1406 was filled by Innocent VII. Gregory XII. was then elected, and continued in office until deposed by the Council of Constance (1415).

DEMANDS FOR REFORM.

These papal disputes, in which the parties were always under anathema of each other, were felt in many quarters to be a scandal, and demands for the adoption of some measures of reform became numerous and

importunate. In that movement the University of Paris took the lead. But in England and Bohemia there were parties, more radical still, who talked of altogether rejecting the papal allegiance. Both Benedict XIII. and Gregory XII. on their election promised to take the steps necessary to bring the schism to an end, but both failed to abide by the engagement. In 1408 their respective councils of cardinals abandoned both popes, and, appealing to Christ, a General Council and a future pope assembled at Leghorn. Thence, with advice of the universities, they issued a call for a General Council to meet at Pisa in 1409. Taking the ground defended by Dr. Gerson, chancellor of the University of Paris—that by its constitution, under Christ, the Church was independent of the pope—and acting thereupon, the council, after a regular form of trial, deposed both the rival popes for violation of their solemn obligation and elected a new candidate, Alexander V., to be sole pope. But the deposed popes, denying the validity of the council, adhered to their claims; so from June 26, 1409, there were three popes, all regularly elected according to one or other of the methods accepted as valid in the Catholic Church.

Alexander V. died May 3, 1410, and John XXIII. was elected in his stead by twenty-six cardinals at Bologna within the same month. Thus the pope of Avignon, though then residing in Spain, the pope of Rome and the pope of Bologna maintained their courts, in bitterest hostility to one another, for seven years.

Constrained by the emperor Sigismond, the pope of Bologna, John XXIII., consented to convoke a coun-

cil on the north side of the Alps for the purpose of settling this difficulty, and of meeting the urgent demand for ecclesiastical reform which came from all parts of Latin Christendom ; that council met at Constance on the 5th of November, 1414. Not much was effected for reform, but the papal schism was brought to an end. All three popes were deposed, and another was elected, who took the name of Martin V.

The papal list follows the Roman line during that long period of division until 1409; it then passes to the pope set up by the Council of Pisa, and his successor, until the deposition of John XXIII., May 29, 1415. From that date there is no pope recognized as true until the election of Martin V., November 11, 1417.

The Council of Constance—like that of Pisa except that it was called by a pope—was constituted on the principle that a council of bishops representing the Church in general is the highest ecclesiastical authority. The members adopted the rule that they should vote by nations, whereby a check was applied to the numerical superiority of the Italian clergy. The nations thus represented were the German, the Italian, the French, the English and the Spanish ; the cardinals constituted a section by themselves.

Inasmuch as John XXIII. was deposed by that council, and Martin V. set up by it and accepted as a true pope by all the Latin Church, it cannot be denied that practically the council was admitted to be lawfully competent to do what it had done, and therefore was a higher power than the pope—a court before which popes could be legally tried. And if that is true of

the Council of Constance, it must be true of any council so constituted. All later popes are in the line of succession from Martin V.

Episcopal authority was fortified by the division of the papal. Different countries chose their own papal allegiance. Councils became of greater importance, and freedom of opinion obtained a certain latitude. Criticism of at least one pope was always safe. Men of reading could not fail to compare the records of earlier Christianity with what was taking place around them. The universities were loud in their demands for reform and the public generally looked for it, but the heads of the hierarchy, to whom the application was made, regarded it with aversion.

Meanwhile, dissenting sects continued to increase, and a greater number, without dissenting from the doctrines of the Church, were dissatisfied with the conduct of her clergy. No one fact appears more frequently in the literature of the fourteenth century than this. It is embodied in the most terrific passages of Dante; it is exposed in the letters of Petrarch and the tales of Boccaccio; it is declared in various forms in Chaucer and in the poem called "*The Visions of Piers Plowman*." But who were to be the reformers? The strength of the mediæval Puritans, the Cathari, was broken; the Albigenses were extinguished. Nor is it certain that, if successful, they would have made the reformation which was needed. The seat of dissent moved northward to the Netherlands, to Bohemia, and especially to England, where it found a leader in John Wycliff, professor of theology in the University of Oxford.

It was in 1360, when Wycliff was master of Balliol College, Oxford, that he first came forward as the champion of the university in the dispute with the mendicant monks. In 1366 he defended the king and the Parliament in rejecting the papal demands of tribute. He was made professor of theology in 1372, and rector of Lutterworth in 1375. He was accused of heresy in 1376 and Gregory XI. instituted an inquiry against him, but he was protected by a strong party among the nobility, headed by John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster, one of the sons of Edward III. The succeeding papal schism furnished an occasion—of which he availed himself—to publish Scripture truth among his countrymen. He furnished his pupils whom he sent on that work with the true evangelical armor in his translation of the Scriptures. In 1381 he was constrained to leave Oxford, and retired to his parish of Lutterworth, where he died in 1384.

The followers of Wycliff—generally called “Lollards”—were protected during the reign of Richard II., but Richard was in 1399 constrained to resign by Henry of Lancaster, who to secure the throne he had usurped threw himself into the interest of the papalists. Parliament in 1401 passed a law that persons convicted of heresy should be burned to death, and executions forthwith began.

The papacy was still in a divided and comparatively feeble condition. It recovered in the time of Henry V., who came to the throne in 1413, and the cause of reformation was persecuted more persistently. Wycliff's doctrines were condemned at Constance, and ten years later (1428) his bones were taken out of the

grave and burned and the ashes cast into a neighboring brook.

But the doctrines of Wycliff were not extinguished in England. They also crossed the sea and met with acceptance in Bohemia. The wife of Richard II., who was a sister of Wenceslaus, king of Bohemia, partook of the spirit of the reformer. The communication thus established between England and Bohemia greatly promoted the interest of reformation in both countries.

Among the earliest Reformers in Bohemia were Conrad of Waldhausen, pastor in Prague, and Milicz of Kremsier. Further advance was made by Matthias of Janow (d. 1394), preacher in the cathedral church of Prague. John Hus, teacher of theology at Prague, followed their example by taking his lessons of divine truth from the Bible. Soon, together with his friend Jerome of Prague, he stood at the head of an almost national movement of reform which was too strong to allow persecution seriously to injure them at Prague. When the council met at Constance, Hus was summoned to appear before it. He went under a letter of safe-conduct from the emperor Sigismond; notwithstanding, he was condemned by the council, and burned at the stake July 6, 1415. Jerome suffered the same fate on the 30th of May following.

During the fourteenth century a change was introduced into the philosophy of scholasticism by William Occam (d. 1347), professor of theology at Paris. That change consisted in a new style of nominalism, according to which the human understanding does not apprehend truth, but only phenomena. The truths of doc-

trine could not be demonstrated philosophically ; they were the revelations which the Holy Spirit continues to make to the Church, and, consistently with the growing system of Romish dogma, Occam taught that revelations had been made to the great doctors of the Church as well as to the apostles. After a bitter controversy his views prevailed in Paris, but were rejected at the University of Prague. In the violent debates carried on through the fourteenth century between realists and Occamists the warfare was waged within the domain of philosophical notions preliminary to theology.

Other eminent scholastics of the same period were Durand (d. 1333), bishop of Meaux, Bradwardine (d. 1346), archbishop of Canterbury, Peter d'Ailly (1425), John Charlier de Gerson, of the University of Paris (1375-1425), and Nicholas de Clemangis (1440). The writings of Gerson and those of some of his contemporaries give evidence that scholasticism had lost its power to satisfy the demands of the human mind.

It was in the fourteenth century that the mystics carried their doctrines to a positive antagonism to the teaching of the scholastics. A certain class of them, called "Friends of God," became of great weight among the reforming agencies of the Church, especially in South-western Germany. They believed God to be the only reality ; all finite things were only seeming. This view, if developed philosophically, might have amounted to nothing more than a commonplace pantheism, which some of them did not avoid, but, upon the whole, they thought only of nearness to a personal and everywhere-present God. The soul of

man must separate itself from the finite as Christ did that it may become, like him, a son of God; this is to be done by contemplation of God and renunciation of the world. They also lamented the corruptions of the Church and advocated a reform, and especially longed for a spiritual revival, which they also did no little to promote. Eminent among their preachers were Henry Eckart of Strasburg (d. 1329), Nicholas of Basil (d. after 1382), John Tauler (d. 1361), Henry Suso of Ulm (d. 1365) and Ruysbroek of Brussels (d. 1381). Their successors continued through the fifteenth century, including also the more moderate Dr. Gerson, Thomas à Kempis, and others who proceeded from the school of Gerard at Deventer, and whose preaching and writings were equally sought after, greatly to the increase of practical piety, until, as a religious revival, their work merged in that of the Reformation.

The theological school of Gerard Groot, at Deventer, was designed to promote true spiritual attainments in uniting sound knowledge with genuine piety. Groot died in 1384; two years afterward one of his disciples founded near Zwoll a chapter of regular canons with a similar purpose.

The rationalizing scholastics, as distinguished from the mystics, were subtle dialecticians, in some cases eloquent preachers, and in more they were laborious writers, but dealt most generally with the superficialities and forms of thought, mapping and dividing and subdividing the surface of that concrete which consisted of philosophy and theology and practical morals and religion as one science. The mystics penetrated deeper into the human heart—its feelings, its hopes, the basis

of its faith and its relations with the unseen world. In some cases the style of their thinking may be characterized as visionary, but, with all their defects, the most profoundly-exercised Christian will enjoy their writings most. The sermons of Tauler were much esteemed by Luther, and the *Theologia Germanica* and the *De imitatione Christi*, though burdened with heavy faults, have been cherished by the pious among the educated ever since the days of their publication.

Another feature which distinguishes this from all other periods of history is the revival of ancient classical literature and taste. In the history of the Church literary art is a matter of very great moment, for it is the medium of addressing instruction to the common mind. Scholasticism spoke the language of students and addressed students alone; it knew nothing of a reading populace. It did little or nothing immediately for instructing the people; another style of literary men was needed to execute that work, and such a class had arisen—men who employed the popular dialects in their productions, and who relied for enlisting of public attention and interest upon those principles which long ages of classical experience had proved the best. Their models and guides to those principles were the best authors of classical antiquity. In that movement the literature of modern Europe began. Dante was the transition; his *Divina Commedia* is the fruit of the Middle Ages as to its substance and form, but his poetic exemplar was Virgil. The true reviver of classical taste in literature was Petrarch (1304–1374). In that pursuit he was early joined by his friend and pupil Boccaccio. Zealously did they both labor in

searching out works of ancient classical authors and in having them copied and republished, as well as in recommending the study of them to others.

Study of classical Latin naturally led also to study of the Greek. Literary men fleeing from Greece before the advance of Turkish conquest and finding refuge in Italy furnished those progressive scholars with teachers of the Greek language. The work thus begun was taken up by others, their number increasing as the interest and the richness of the rediscovered mine became better known.

Under the force of classical example some of the modern languages—first of all the Italian, and then the English—began to assume the dignity of letters and popular treatment of interesting topics took a wider range. The author of "*Piers Plowman*," Maundeville, Chaucer, Wycliff, Gower and Barbour in Great Britain were the contemporaries of Petrarch and Boccaccio in Italy; and Wycliff, Chaucer and the author of "*Piers Plowman*" were all advocates of ecclesiastical reform. English literature opened in the most important and successful effort for reformation made in the fourteenth century and with the English Bible.

In France the attainments were not what might have been expected. The Troubadours suffered with the Albigenes; the Trouvère literature existed chiefly among the Normans, and after the pacification of England those who produced it made that country their principal residence.

In respect to vernacular literature Italy and England were greatly in advance of all other nations. The

English took the bent of religious reform; the Italian, that of art.

The Eastern empire was now contracted to a small space, and that continually threatened by the new power of the Ottoman Turks. In 1367, Armenia was conquered by the mamelukes; such fate also befell the Coptic Christians in Egypt; and the churches in both countries were subjected to a cruel oppression.

On the other hand, in the North of Europe there was gradually emancipating itself from foreign domination a power destined in the course of ages to become the successful champion of the Greek Church to the ends of the earth. But at that time Russia was still struggling for existence in war with the Mongol.

CHRONOLOGY FROM A. D. 1418 TO 1517.

Emperors of Germany.	Emperors of the East.	Popes.	Patriarchs of Constantinople.
1410 Sigismund,	1436 1391 Manuel,	1424 1417 Martin V.,	1431 1416 Joseph II., 1439
1438 Albert II., 1439	1424 John VI.,	1448 1431 Eugenius IV.,	1440 Metrophanes II., 1446
1440 Frederick III., 1493	1448 Constantine,	1447 1431 Eugenius IV.,	1446 Gregory IV., 1453
	1453 Constantine,	1447 Nicholas V.,	1455 After the fall of Constantinople.
	1453 Constantine falls into the hands of the Mohammedans under the sultan Mohammed II. May 29, 1453.	1455 Calixtus III.,	1453 Gennadius, 1458
		1458 Pius II.,	1458 Isidore II.
		1464 Paul II.,	1464 Joseph I., banished.
		1471 Sixtus IV.,	1471 Mark I., banished.
		1484 Innocent VIII.,	1471 Simeon, deposed.
		1492 Alexander VI.,	1484 Denis II., deposed.
1493 Maximilian I., 1519		1503 Pius III.,	1484 Mark II.
		1503 Julius II.,	1484 Simeon, restored, and again deposed.
		1513 Leo X.,	1492 Raphael I.
			1492 Maximus III.
			1496 Niphon II., banished.
			1503 Denis, restored.
			1503 Maximus IV.
			1513 Niphon, restored.
			1513 Ioachim, banished.
			1513 Pacomus, banished.
			1513 Ioachim, restored.
			1513 Pacomus, restored.
			1513 Theolaptus.
			1521 Jeremiah I.

CHAPTER XII.

PROGRESS OF THE REVIVAL OF LEARNING.—REVIVAL OF RELIGION.—OF THE STUDY OF SCRIPTURE.— OF PREACHING.

(1418-1517.)

THE various reform movements which took their rise or emerged into notice in the fourteenth century continued to make progress in the period which opened in the last weeks of the Council of Constance and closed with the publication of Luther's theses, in 1517.

After the election of a pope the Council of Constance lost its importance, and, having appointed a succession of General Councils to keep supervision over the interests of the Church, it terminated its own sessions on the 22d of April, 1418.

The first in that succession of councils was appointed to meet at Pavia in 1423. By the pope it was diverted to Sienna, and then dissolved before it had transacted any business. The next, appointed to meet seven years later, assembled at Basil December 14, 1431. Martin V. died in February of that year, and was succeeded by Eugenius IV., elected by the cardinals.

The Council of Basil entered earnestly into the at-

tempt to reform the Church. In its first years the pope was constrained to yield on all points. Some serious abuses were condemned and abolished; papal prerogatives and revenue were seriously threatened. Eugenius, in order to exercise the more control over its proceedings, issued a bull ordering the council to remove to Ferrara. Some bishops complied, but the greater number remained at Basil. Unfortunately, they passed sentence of deposition upon Eugenius, and elected Amadeus VIII. of Savoy in his stead, as Felix V. This introduction of a new schism so soon after the Church had with much trouble composed the disorders belonging to the former prejudiced the cause of the council. Some of the members, in dissatisfaction, returned home, and after the month of May, 1443, the council gradually fell apart. In 1448 it removed to Lausanne, and dissolved next year. Felix V. had already resigned.

During the early days of that council, while it was yet a real power, occasion was taken to revive the ancient liberties of the Gallican Church and to extend and define them. France was then in one of her lowest periods of adversity, and the English were still in possession of Paris, when Charles VII., on the 7th of July, 1437, executed the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges, by which he accepted the decisions of the Council of Basil. They continued to be law in France until December, 1513, when Francis I. sacrificed them to his concordat with the pope.

Meanwhile, at the pope's council in Ferrara, and later in Florence, the principal event was another show of union with the Greek Church—of all such, the

most deceitful and humiliating to those concerned. The emperor John VII. Palæologus, reduced to the last extremity by aggression of the Turks, and the pope, striving to counteract the Council of Basel, agreed in earnestly desiring the union—the former in hope that Western arms might thereby be brought to the aid of his own in repelling the Mohammedan, and the latter believing that the weight of such a vast addition to his jurisdiction would enable him to overmatch his opponents, if not to overwhelm them by the torrent of a crusade. In papal ships, and partly with papal money, the impoverished emperor left Constantinople, accompanied by the patriarch and a number of Greek prelates. They were received with pomp and adulation at Venice, and afterward at Ferrara. But the meetings of the council were thinly attended, and business was delayed. After about two years, and after the removal to Florence, the act of union was passed. It was one in which the necessities of the Greeks constrained them to yield enough to render the whole unavailing. They returned home to encounter a storm of disapproval. Their action was utterly rejected. A respectable minority of them, with Mark, bishop of Ephesus, at their head, had dissented from everything at variance with Greek orthodoxy; they were now the national heroes. Many of the majority regretted the part they had taken in the affair, and expressed their repentance in terms of profound contrition. In attempting to save his country the emperor had lost its confidence and support, and was denounced as a traitor to its most sacred cause. The pompously constructed union proved a nullity; as a constrained

attempt at compromise its statements of doctrine are of little value as touching the faith of the Greek Church.

Upon the death of Pope Eugenius IV., February 7, 1447, Nicholas V. took up the policy of his predecessors in respect to the authority of his office, but was a man of superior liberality in other respects, and an eminent patron of literature and learning. Upon the fall of Constantinople he issued a summons for a crusade. But the time for such enterprises had passed; none responded to the call. Calixtus III., Pius II. and Paul II. successively adhered to the same policy, but effected nothing of any note.

Sixtus IV. (1471-1484), although a man of public spirit who enlarged the papal library and executed several improvements in the city of Rome, spent most of his time in measures to enrich himself and his kindred and in petty Italian wars. Those who praise him boast that "no prince ever offered him an injury or indignity which he did not return with due revenge."

Innocent VIII., Alexander VI. and Julius II. were men of such character that it is amazing that they ever obtained election to any ecclesiastical office whatever. In 1513, Leo X., of the illustrious De' Medici of Florence, succeeded Julius and restored at least a decent decorum to the papal court. Leo X. had little claim to piety, but he was a wise ruler, elegant in his pleasures and an eminent patron of the fine arts. His first few years restored, to all appearance, the full harmony of the papacy with the secular powers. Accordingly, he could go on to gratify his taste for the grand and the beautiful in art. The new cathedral of St. Peter's

was his favorite enterprise, and money was to be collected for its completion by all available devices.

During the whole of this period the opposite currents of events continued to advance with increasing rapidity—on one side, the practice of old abuses and reckless development of their consequences; on the other, the effort to obtain some correction of them, though often defeated, was becoming better sustained by strength and intelligence.

Restoration of papal unity brought with it the idea of restoring everything to the standard of the thirteenth century. Practices and dogmas to which one party objected were set forth by the other in a bolder and sometimes most reprehensible manner. Transubstantiation was urged in its grossest extreme in the repeated trick of the bleeding host; adoration of the Virgin Mary received additions; belief in her immaculate conception continued to gain ground; the rosary systematized the vain repetition of prayer addressed to her; and her house, removed by angels from Nazareth to Italy, became the holy shrine of Loretto.

Indulgences had been a salable commodity for ages, but the traffic in them was now pushed to an unprecedented extent. The principle upon which they were justified was invented by the schoolmen out of pre-existing practices, the granting of absolution by priests, belief in purgatory and the necessity of good works in order to salvation, the merits of saints and the papal power of the keys. Practices and beliefs firmly rooted in the public mind had been critically treated, their principles elaborated into dogmas, through a process of seemingly rational cogency, by such men

as Albertus Magnus, Alexander Hales and Thomas Aquinas, and were now practically applied in ecclesiastical business.

The indulgence was granted by the pope, through his power as vicar of Christ, to the faithful, whether in this life or in purgatory, out of the superabundance of the merits of Christ and of the saints. Where the pope was not himself present, the favor could be extended through his properly-commissioned agents and by means of a written paper properly signed and sealed. Such were the documents now multiplied enormously and offered for sale, carried into various countries and recommended to purchasers—in some places quietly, in others loudly and publicly, as peddlers vend their wares—and the plea for such activity in the traffic, in some quarters put forth openly, was to raise money to complete the church of St. Peter's. Such was the style in which things were conducted by the leaders of one party, which might be called the conservatist of that time.

With such facilities for obtaining pardon of sin or indulgence in it, with such example as that produced among the clergy by celibacy enforced and concubinage freely connived at, what was to be expected of practical morals among the laity? No period in the history of Christendom bears a deeper brand of moral license than the fifteenth century and the early part of the sixteenth.

On the other hand, the movement in the direction of reform was proceeding by various channels. Restoration of classical learning continued to advance. Upon the fall of Constantinople many more learned Greeks took refuge in the West, where they maintained

themselves by teaching their native tongue. With the progress of Greek scholarship the philosophy of Plato was revived. The illustrious Cosmo de' Medici founded a Platonic school at Florence; help was thereby brought to the study of art and a rival set up to scholasticism. By the end of the fifteenth century Latin was once more written in classical purity and the best Greek authors were familiar to the scholars of the West. It was inevitable that the original Greek text of the Scriptures should receive a large share of attention; in the beginning of the sixteenth century the Greek New Testament was one of the most salable books.

The arts of painting, sculpture and architecture had grown up with reviving literature. Gothic architecture, like the poetry of Dante, was a fruit of the Middle Ages and reached its prime in the fourteenth century, but the revival of learning rekindled a taste for the Roman; in the fifteenth century Italy saw a great many buildings of that style erected. Greatest of all, the new St. Peter's was slowly rising from its foundations. It had been commenced by Nicholas V. in 1450, but, although carried forward by architects of the highest talent and with great expenditure of money, was in the time of Leo X. far from complete; nor was it finished until one hundred years later (1614). At the opening of the sixteenth century the excellence and renown of her arts absorbed the pride and the best energies of Italy. In this respect her example was followed in the Netherlands and some places in Germany. France and England were interrupted in their progress by the wars with each other and by the civil broils which long distracted both.

Within the same period the Christian Spaniards succeeded in finally expelling the Moors from Granada (1492). The Portuguese had driven them from their part of the peninsula at an earlier date and extended their conquests to Africa. The mariner's compass had been introduced some time before; it was now employed by daring Portuguese mariners in explorations of the Atlantic Ocean off the African coast until by successive attempts they ultimately rounded the Cape of Good Hope and sailed to India (1498); while Columbus, in the service of Spain, with a still bolder daring, launched directly across the ocean, and reached the West Indies in 1492. Thus was reopened a productive trade which for centuries had been obstructed by the conquests of the Turks, and a new continent discovered. The commerce of the world was turned to the paths of the ocean. The countries on the Atlantic coast rose in importance, while those on the Mediterranean declined—a change of the utmost importance in the great ecclesiastical controversy about to ensue.

The new or revived arts were in the first instance exercised in the service of the Romish Church. The only exception was that of printing, which from the first was an agent of progress, on whatever side of the controversy it wrought. Its earliest productions were executed before the middle of the fifteenth century; in the next sixty or seventy years the book upon which its labors were chiefly employed was the Bible, first printed with movable metal types by Faust and Gutenberg, at Mayence, between 1450 and 1455. Several editions of the Latin New Testament, followed

one another at no great intervals, and many translations made from it into the modern languages were printed before the end of that century. Hebrew scholarship had also commenced its career among Christians of the West, and two editions of the whole Hebrew Bible were printed within the same time. By the year 1517 the Complutensian Polyglot Bible was printed at Alcala, in Spain.

After all, the main stream of improvement, which carried all these agencies along with it and made its own benign uses of them, was the increasing interest in evangelical religion. The influences set in activity by the mystic preachers, not so much from their theory of faith as in that they preached Christ, operated in that direction within the bosom of the Catholic Church. Such, likewise, was the moderate mysticism—or, more properly, spiritual piety tinged with monasticism—which perpetuated itself from the school of Gerard.

But head and front of all was the great dissenting movement which, commenced in England, was now most conspicuous in Bohemia and Moravia, where in the face of persecution the Reformers organized themselves for defence and under their brave and gifted leader Ziska for many years held their ground against the emperor in successful war. Finally their enemies succeeded in dividing them by offering a compromise which only a part of their number could accept. Those who submitted—called “Calixtines,” because the restoration of the cup in the Eucharist was one of the conditions of the compromise—finding that the conditions were not complied with on the part

of the Catholics, returned in considerable numbers and reunited with the uncompromising party, who were called "Taborites," and formed with them the covenant of the *Unitas Fratrum*. About 1470 they published a translation of the Bible in the Bohemian language and sent commissioners into various countries to inquire into the state of religion. About the beginning of the sixteenth century they had still some two hundred congregations, by whom fraternal relations had been established with the Waldenses.

In Spain and Italy also voices were raised in advocacy of reformation, but papal authority was too near in any part of the latter country, and the Inquisition most unrelenting in the other.

At the beginning of the sixteenth century monarchy was in the ascendant. England, France and Spain were at last completely consolidated, each around its own regal centre, and the German empire had come under the hereditary rule of the house of Hapsburg. The civil rulers no longer admitted that they were subordinate to the pope in temporal things. But Leo X. did not press that claim. Maintaining, as he did, manageable relations with the great monarchs, and enjoying a perfect agreement with them on the subject of religion, why should the murmurs of dissenters be a cause of anxiety? They, in fact, occasioned none to the gay and accomplished pope.

From the Vatican point of view the prospect was a flattering one in the early years of Leo X., but the expenses of the papal court were great and patronage of the arts liberal, and the work upon St. Peter's involved an enormous additional outlay. To meet

these demands recourse was had, among other devices, to an increased activity in the sale of indulgences. The method of farming them out and peddling them over the country was pushed to a degree of recklessness which was the more offensive as in the face of a greatly-advanced popular intelligence.

In the prosecution of that traffic, Germany was divided among three commissioners. The elector Albert of Mayence, who was also archbishop of Magdeburg, assumed the chief management of commission for his own provinces. Among the venders whom he employed, John Tetzel, a Dominican monk, made himself notoriously conspicuous. He ventured to omit the condition of repentance for the sins pardoned : such was the virtue of his indulgences that they of themselves effected pardon of the sins for which they were purchased. It is surprising to read of the success which followed him, but there were multitudes all over Germany who were shocked by the scandalous practice.

Martin Luther, an Augustinian monk, and professor and preacher at Wittenberg, in Electoral Saxony, who had already opposed himself to certain doctrinal errors of the Romish Church, was moved to condemn the whole system of indulgences as having no authority from the word of God. An arduous spiritual experience and careful study of Scripture had already given him victory over many of the superstitions of his time. His duty was plain. He preached against indulgences and warned his people against them as an imposition upon their faith. Tetzel heard of it, and was furious against the heretic. Luther was not a man to be in-

timidated or deterred from taking the most effective stand for the truth which he believed. On the evening of the 31st of October, the eve of the feast of All Saints, in the year 1517—a day on which all who should attend church and confess should receive plenary indulgence—he affixed to the door of the great church of Wittenberg a list of ninety-five theses against indulgences, which he announced himself prepared to defend the next day in the university against all opposers. That act was solely his own; he committed no person to responsibility for it but himself. Going forward in reliance upon divine truth, and fearless of danger in so doing, he took a step which, however simple in itself, became, from the existing state of the Church and of the world, an era in general history—one of those great events by which we mark the progress of mankind.

CHRONOLOGY FROM A. D. 1517 TO 1648.

German Emperors.	Popes.	Patriarchs of Constantinople.	Russian Czars.
1519 Charles V., abdicated	1513 Leo X., 1523 Adrian IV., 1534 Clement VII., 1534 Paul III., 1550 Julius III., 1555 Marcellus II., 1555 Paul IV., 1559 Pius IV., 1566 Pius V., 1572 Gregory XIII., 1585 Sixtus V., 1590 Urban VII., 1590 Gregory XIV., 1591 Innocent IX., 1592 Clement VIII., 1605 Leo XI., 1605 Paul V., 1621 Gregory XV., 1623 Urban VIII., 1644 Innocent X.,	1521 Jeremiah I., deposed 1523 Joannicus, expelled. 1524 Jeremiah, restored. 1546 Denis III., 1555 Joasaph II., 1563 Metrophanes III., abdicated 1572 Jeremiah II., attempted Lutheran reform rejected. Jeremiah expelled. 1579 Metrophanes III., restored. 1580 Jeremiah II., restored. Deposed. 1583 Pacomius. 1584 Theoleptus II., 1585 Jeremiah II., third time, 1594 Matthew II., expelled. 1595 Metrophanes II., expelled. 1600 Neophytus II., banished. 1602 Matthew, restored. 1602 Raphael II. 1606 Neophytus II., restored. Again banished. 1613 Timotheus II. 1621 Cyril Lucaris attempts a Calvinist reform. Deposed five times, and four times restored. Finally put to death by the sultan 1638 Cyril of Beres, restored the second time and again banished. 1639 Parthenius,	1453 Since the downfall of Constantinople the strongest protector of the Greek Church has arisen in Russia. That relation began with 1462 Ivan III., and continued with increasing power throughout the reigns of 1505 Basil IV., 1533 Ivan IV. the Terrible, 1584 Theodore I., 1598 Boris Godunoff, until the Polish invasion and upon the expulsion of the Poles the rise of the Romanoff dynasty. 1613 Michael, 1645 Alexis,
1558 Ferdinand I.,	1555 Paul IV.,	1579 Metrophanes III., restored.	1533 Ivan IV. the Terrible,
1564 Maximilian II.,	1572 Gregory XIII.,	1583 Pacomius.	1584 Theodore I.,
1576 Rodolph II.,	1590 Urban VII.,	1594 Matthew II., expelled.	1598 Boris Godunoff,
1612 Mathias,	1605 Leo XI.,	1602 Matthew, restored.	until the Polish invasion and upon the expulsion of the Poles the rise of the Romanoff dynasty.
	1605 Paul V.,	1606 Neophytus II., restored.	1613 Michael,
1617 Ferdinand II.,	1621 Gregory XV.,	1613 Timotheus II.	1645 Alexis,
1637 Ferdinand III.,	1644 Innocent X.,	1638 Cyril of Beres, restored the second time and again banished.	
		1639 Parthenius,	

PERIOD THIRD.

(A. D. 1517-1885.)

THE aim of the Reformation was to emancipate the Bible from the restraints of ecclesiasticism, to maintain its freedom and its right to be regarded as the only rule of faith and practice, and thereby to bring Christian life nearer to God.

The Reformation was not the work of a man, not the fruit of a single act of daring: it was one of the steps of progress in the work of God which had been going on in the heart of the people for three hundred years, and, being such, could not be set back. But, like the gospel itself, such reform could take effect only upon those who would accept it.

In 1516, while Luther was making his incipient attacks upon the doctrine of justification by good works, Ulrich Zwingli, at Einsiedeln, in Switzerland, was preaching against the worship of the Virgin Mary, and other Swiss Reformers were also engaged in their preliminary labors.

Henceforward the history of Western Christianity is divided into different channels, and yet there are certain common epochs which like broad bars run across them all. The first of those epochs occurs in the year 1530, when the theology of the Reformation first received a systematic shape and the construction

and conflict of confessions began. The next occurs in and about 1648, when the period of confession-making came to an end and Protestant nations on the European Continent secured the recognition of their independence. A third is marked by the outbreak of the French Revolution, and a fourth presents itself in the Vatican Council of 1870 and the downfall of the temporal power of the papacy.

CHAPTER I.

THE REFORMATION CRISIS.

(1517-1530.)

THE interval between 1517 and 1530, though brief, consisted of different stages:

1. Luther's attack upon indulgences and controversy on that topic as a faithful subject of the pope, conducted by public addresses, epistles and oral debates.

2. Denial of the absolute power of the pope, leading, in the course of controversy, to discussion of the whole structure of the papacy, issuing in Luther's rejection of papal allegiance and appeal to a General Council, and his defence at the Diet of Worms.

3. A third stage was marked by attempts to repress the Reformation by action of civil and ecclesiastical courts, and, on the side of the Reformers, to defend it by clear statements of faith as sustained by Scripture, and by careful instruction of the public in the nature of the case, issuing in the great diet at Augsburg (1530) and the confession presented there, and at the same time the confessions drawn up by Zwingli and Œcolampadius for Switzerland.

Luther was peculiarly constituted and prepared to be the principal leader at that juncture. Certain ex-

ternal circumstances favored him. Staupitz, vicar-general of the Augustinian order for Germany, was a man of kindred faith and longer Christian experience, and was to Luther an invaluable adviser; another staunch friend was the elector Frederic of Saxony, whose subject he was. Thus encouraged and protected, he went on with his work. In the month of November he defended the doctrine of the theses in a Latin disputation for the learned, as well as in a vernacular discourse for the general public. Tetzel responded. Prierias, a high official of the papal court, sustained the cause of indulgences on the ground of the infallible authority and absolute power of the pope; Luther, in reply, recognized no authority as infallible save that of the Holy Scriptures. A new step was thus taken in the controversy: the papacy itself was assailed.

Luther was summoned to appear in Rome, August 7, 1518; by intercession of the elector Frederic an examination at Augsburg was substituted, which took place in October of the same year. Luther appeared there. Cajetan, the papal legate, demanded of him a full recantation, without any discussion; to that he refused to submit, and appealed to the pope when the pope should be better informed of the case; but on the 9th of November a papal bull was issued in which the whole responsibility for indulgences was assumed by the pope. Luther, condemned by the pope, appealed to a General Council.

Some of the Church authorities became alarmed and attempted to stop the controversy, but the controversy could not stop. Dr. Eck of Ingolstadt took it up on the papal side; between him and Carlstadt, one

of Luther's fellow-professors, a disputation took place before a large assembly at Leipsic and lasted several days. By action of his opponents the Reformer was constrained to appear in the debate himself. It was now that Philip Melanchthon entered the field with his treatise *Defensio contra Eckium*.

A papal bull was issued June 15, 1520, condemning forty-one propositions of Luther's and commanding him to confess his faults within sixty days; in case he failed to do so excommunication was threatened, and any magistrate who could lay hold upon him was charged to arrest and send him to Rome. He replied with a treatise on Christian freedom. In July he published his appeal to the German nobles, to enlist them in the cause of the Reformation.

Seeing that now he could no longer acknowledge allegiance to Rome, Luther resolved upon a public declaration to that effect. Accordingly, on the 10th of December, 1520, after notice given, he publicly burned the papal bull issued against him, and with it a copy of the canon law and certain decretals of the popes. This was Luther's Declaration of Independence, which he also abundantly maintained with his pen.

From December 10, 1520, the German Reformation stands by itself, a separate interest in the Church.

The emperor Maximilian died in January, 1519, and in July of the same year his grandson, Charles I. of Spain, was elected to succeed him, and thereby became Charles V. of the empire.

In the year 1520, when Luther threw off the papal yoke, the civil government of Europe was chiefly in

the hands of three men—Henry VIII. of England, Francis I. of France and Charles V., who now held a larger dominion than had ever in Europe been ruled by one man—Spain, Naples and other parts in Italy, Sicily and other important islands in the Mediterranean, the Netherlands, the German empire, with which were now connected the kingdoms of Hungary and Bohemia and the hereditary estates of the house of Hapsburg, and all the lands discovered by Spanish navigators and explorers on both continents of America and the West Indies. The eastern portion of his European estates he conceded to his brother Ferdinand. All of these great monarchs were staunch supporters of the Romish Church, and within their respective dominions prohibited the Reformation and persecuted its adherents.

Outside of these monarchies, to the east, the Ottoman Turks had reached the summit of their success under the reign of Suleyman, called "the Magnificent," who was then on the throne. Their empire bordered on that of Charles V., and their armies more than once penetrated far into the countries over which his brother ruled. Although they knew it not, those followers of the False Prophet exerted no little influence in helping forward the Christian Reformation.

The first assembly of the German states after the accession of Charles V. was summoned to meet at Worms, January 6, 1521. It actually met three months later, attended by an unusual number of princes and nobles, lay and ecclesiastic, all desirous of presenting themselves before the young emperor in a style as impressive as they could command. The

diet was one of great interest as touching the policy of the new government in general, but the question of most importance was that of the Reformation.

On receiving a pledge of protection from the emperor, Luther went to Worms, and on the 17th and 18th of April stood before the diet. His defence on that occasion, conducted with great learning and prudence, had a most favorable effect upon his cause, yet the majority decided against him; and the result of the deliberations, so far as he was concerned, was an edict condemning his doctrines and ordering the civil authorities to arrest him as soon as the time of his safe-conduct had expired and bring him to punishment. It also enjoined the princes of Germany to suppress his adherents and confiscate their property; his works were to be destroyed. Any one acting contrary to the spirit of that decree was to be laid under ban of the empire.

But Luther did not reach home on that occasion. As he was proceeding on his journey through a lonely place a band of armed horsemen set upon him, overpowered his few attendants, seized him, threw over his monkish costume the cloak of a knight, constrained him to mount a led horse and dashed off with him into the depths of the Thuringian forest. For ten months Luther was lost to the eye of the public; those who wished his death learned what a commotion would have been produced had the sentence passed upon him been actually executed. He was concealed by friends in the castle of the Wartburg, and spent his time in study and writing. There the greater part, if not the whole, of his translation of the New Testament was made.

Meanwhile, the edict was not put in execution except under the rule of the elector of Brandenburg, the duke of Bavaria, the duke of Saxony, and of some ecclesiastical princes who by their exceptional severity intensified the interest in the Reformation cause. The emperor was prevented from taking part in this persecution by the war in which he was immediately involved with France, and his brother Ferdinand was entirely occupied with measures of defence against the Turk.

At Wittenberg the structure of the new Church order was carried forward under the leadership of Melanchthon. The first systematic exposition of Lutheran doctrine was made in Melanchthon's *Loci communes Rerum Theologicarum*, published during Luther's residence in the Wartburg.

But a party arose at Wittenberg, headed by Professor Bodenstein, called "of Carlstadt," which carried the new liberty to a pernicious extreme. Disorders were created which the mild Melanchthon was unable to reduce. Unexpected by all, Luther again appeared among them (March, 1522). By his prompt regulative power, his preaching and personal presence, people were won back to a peaceable prosecution of Church work in the orderly unfolding and practical effect of the Holy Scriptures. His translation of the New Testament was published the same year; two years afterward the whole Bible was presented to the public in the German language, rendered directly from the Greek and the Hebrew.

Disorders provoked by long-continued oppression and conducted by injudicious men broke out about

that time, especially an insurrection in Southern Germany called "the Peasants' War." At the battle of Frankenhausen, in 1525, its strength was broken by an overwhelming Roman Catholic force.

From 1521 to 1530 the Reformation in Germany, having assumed a separate ground, but without a complete statement of its principles, was involved in controversies on every side. It still looked for reconciliation with the Catholic Church through action of a council; with a view to that, various were the conventions held for statement of doctrine and of grievances. The emperor Maximilian had drawn up a list of ten grounds of complaint in Germany against Rome. These, afterward increased to one hundred, were presented to the Diet of Worms, and under the name of the *Centum Gravamina* went to justify the cause of the Reformation with many who otherwise would have taken no interest in it.

Leo X. died on the 1st of December, 1521, and was succeeded by Hadrian VI., a pious man who recognized the existence of evils in the Church and promised to remove them, while he demanded the execution of the edict against the heresy of Luther; he died September 14, 1523. Clement VII. also made promise of satisfying the complaints of Germany, provided the edict were put in execution. A diet was held at Nuremberg in 1522-23, and another in 1524. At the first the legate of Hadrian made that demand; at the second, the legate of Clement. But in the existing condition of his affairs the emperor could not comply with it, and most of the German states were opposed to it.

Frederick the Wise of Saxony died May 5, 1525;

his brother John, a sincere Christian and a friend of Luther, came into his place and sustained the cause. Several important additions were made to the adherents of the Reformation about that date, of whom the most important were the landgrave of Hesse and Albert of Brandenburg, grand master of the Teutonic Knights, who in 1525 took his place as duke of Prussia and with his people and their bishops joined the Reformation.

Wars between France and the empire and between the empire and the Turks completely occupied the monarchs for the next five years. The Reformers availed themselves of the favorable opportunity to put into fitting order the ecclesiastical institutions of their respective countries. Leaders in that work were Philip, landgrave of Hesse, and the elector John of Saxony. The schools were put in a state of efficiency and the University of Wittenberg was at the height of its prosperity. That of Marburg, in Hesse, was founded in 1527.

A diet which met at Spires in 1529 ordered that the edict of Worms should be enforced wherever the Reformation was not already sanctioned by law. Against that act six princes and fourteen cities presented a protest, April 19, 1529. Hence the name PROTESTANT came to be applied to all who agreed in carrying forward the reformation then in hand.

The emperor, successful in war, concluded a treaty with the pope at Barcelona, June 29, 1529, and with France the peace of Cambray, August 5 of the same year, and in February following was crowned emperor and king of Lombardy. He had summoned a diet to

meet at Augsburg in which the religious dissensions of Germany were to be finally disposed of. Protestants felt that they must be prepared with a complete, precise and summary statement of their doctrines; in compliance with that exigency the Articles of Torgau were drawn up by Luther, Melanchthon, Jonas and Bugenhagen. Attempts were made to unite the Lutheran with the Reformed of Switzerland in confession of doctrine, which proved ineffectual chiefly from difference of belief touching the Lord's Supper.

The elector of Saxony took with him to Augsburg Melanchthon and three other eminent theologians. Luther could not safely leave the protection of Saxony. While waiting at Augsburg for the arrival of the emperor, Melanchthon made good use of the time in composing a more complete confession, which was the one read before the diet on the 25th of June, 1530. A confutation was prepared by Dr. Eck and read on the 3d of August. An apology for the Confession, in reply to Eck, was also written by Melanchthon, and subsequently published. A committee was appointed to negotiate a reconciliation between the parties, but nothing came of it.

Four free cities, Constance, Strasburg, Memmingen and Lindau, presented a separate confession, which was called "the Tetrapolitan." The Reformed of Switzerland had also a confession prepared for that occasion, but, as they did not belong to the empire, it was not called for.

The final decree of the diet granted to Protestants until April 15, 1531, for consideration, and threatened violence if they did not submit by that time.

In Switzerland the progress of the Reformation was more rapid than in Germany. In Basil the sentiment produced by the General Council seems to have retained its hold upon some leading minds through the rest of the fifteenth century. In the first years of the sixteenth we find some of the professors and students in the university earnestly enlisted in the cause of ecclesiastical reform; among whom, Thomas Wyttenbach was distinguished as early as 1505. Capito, Hedio, Erasmus, and others of like spirit, were students, teachers or residents there prior to 1517; their attitude in those days was the preliminary one in which men expected the Church to reform itself by means of its own authorities, and was comparatively safe. Some of them never went farther.

Ulrich Zwingle received his first theological direction from Wyttenbach. Ten years of a quiet pastorate in the heart of the Alps, at Glarus, during which time he made himself well acquainted with the Greek New Testament, wrought full conviction in his heart that the Scriptures are the sole and sufficient standard of religion. In 1516 he was induced to reside as priest and preacher at Einsiedeln, where he began to encounter some of the prevailing errors. Einsiedeln was the seat of a favorite shrine of the Virgin Mary; multitudes of pilgrims flocked there to pay their devotions. Zwingle was moved with compassion for them, and preached against the popular delusion. Christ, he told them, alone can save from sin, and his atonement satisfies for all believers in all places alike. In 1518 he opposed the sale of indulgences in Switzerland, and had the satisfaction of seeing that abuse with-

drawn. The same year he was elected preacher in the great church of Zurich, where, in order to promote the knowledge of Scripture among the people, he adopted the method of explaining certain books of the New Testament in regular course; the method proved attractive, and large congregations attended his preaching.

The excitement about Luther at that date caused Zwingli to be also suspected of heresy. He did not, however, enter the polemical arena of the Reformation until 1522, when his treatise on the obligation of fasting appeared. By that time several other Swiss preachers were pursuing a similar course. In May of that year the bishop of Constance issued a pastoral letter to warn all against innovation, and the Diet of Lucerne forbade preaching likely to produce disquiet. A brisk controversy ensued, but lasted only a few years before Zurich and several other cantons took their stand clearly and fully for the Reformation as taught by their own preachers. A conference between the Reformers and the Romish theologians was invited by the council of Zurich, and took place in January, 1523. On that occasion the council was so well pleased with Zwingli's defence of the doctrines he preached that they charged him to persevere in his course and recommended their other preachers to follow his example. All excesses were wisely held in check, and the work progressed quietly but steadily. One after another all objects and usages of superstition disappeared; "the monasteries were suppressed and changed into schools and almshouses." The change in public worship was completed by the celebration

of the Lord's Supper in its original simplicity on the 13th of April, 1525, in the great minster of Zurich.

Meanwhile, other cantons were pursuing a similar course at one stage and another, and some were hesitating. A disputation held at Berne in January, 1528, decided the government of that canton to accept the Reformation, and other cantons which had been wavering followed that example.

The confederation was forthwith divided, the northern and western cantons being chiefly Protestant and those on the eastern and southern sides remaining attached to the Roman Catholic religion. Each group sought alliances, the latter with Austria and the former with Strasburg and Hesse, carrying the Reformed alliance down the Rhine. At that juncture occurred the diet of Augsburg. Zwingle was not present at that assembly, but prepared about the same time his *Ratio Fidei* for the emperor, and his *Expositio Fidei Christianæ* for the king of France. Œcolampadius, who was present, drew up that confession which, although not read before the diet, was afterward the basis of the first Basil Confession.

The chief point of difference between the Saxon and Helvetic Reformers was in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Luther taught that the real body of Christ is present with the sacramental bread, but does not take its place. Zwingle denied that to be the meaning of Scripture, and interpreted the Lord's words as instituting a memorial ordinance in which his people, in partaking of bread and wine, apprehend his body and his blood, which those signify, as actually broken and shed for them, and thereby receive through faith

the real blessing of the Lord's sacrifice. The Tetrapolitan Reformers, of whom the leading mind was Martin Bucer, stood on a different ground from both, and mediate between the two, but nearer to the Lutheran side, to which they not long afterward passed over by the Wittenberg Concord of 1536.

In the year succeeding the Diet of Augsburg the Romish cantons of Switzerland made war on Zurich, and a battle was fought at Cappel, October 11, 1531, in which the forces of Zurich were defeated, and Zwingli, who had gone out to attend to the wounded and dying, was slain. The death of Œcolampadius followed soon after, November 23 of the same year.

CHAPTER II.

CONFESSIONS AND RELIGIOUS WARS.

(1530-1648.)

FROM the date of the Confession of Augsburg until the Peace of Westphalia the history of the Church in Germany consists of three periods—one in which the parties labored in attempts to convince each other or so to frame a creed that they might agree upon it; the second was a period of compromise, commencing with the religious Peace of Augsburg, in 1555, and extending to 1618; and the third, beginning with the latter date, was one of open war, which did not come to an end until after the lapse of thirty years.

In view of the final decree of Augsburg, the Protestants of Germany, having no intention to submit, began to prepare for the encounter of force. The League of Smalcald was formed, March 29, 1531, and soon afterward strengthened by alliance with Bavaria and with the king of France, both of whom entered into that relation for political reasons. More cordial was the alliance with Denmark. Next year (July 23, 1532) the religious Peace of Nuremberg provided that religious matters should remain as they were until settled by a council or a new diet.

The Augsburg Confession proclaimed the doctrines

of the Lutheran Church and prepared the way for large addition to the number of its adherents. It became a standard of Lutheran faith and gave union and harmony to the whole Lutheran Reformation, but it also determined the difference between that communion and the "Reformed," the latter name being applied to all who in various countries coincided with the views of the Swiss Reformers.

From the two centres thus constituted in Electoral Saxony and Western Switzerland, Reformation influences spread rapidly in all directions. The Saxon form of doctrine was soon accepted in Central and Northern Germany, in Denmark, Sweden and Norway, harmonized with the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren and gained considerable numbers in Hungary. Some of the German states down the Rhine from Basil, and following that line northward between the centre of Germany and the Netherlands as far as the German Sea, accepted Reformed doctrine. Such also became the creed of Protestants in the Netherlands, in France, in England, in Scotland, and of the Magyar population in Hungary. Though differing on a few points of doctrine, these two grand divisions of the Protestant connection supported each other against violence.

The severity which Charles V. never felt himself in condition to inflict upon the Protestants of Germany he exemplified in his hereditary estates in the Netherlands. There had risen the school of Gerard, and there had flourished the evangelical agencies which proceeded from it. John Wessel of Gröningen anticipated almost every doctrine afterward defended by Luther. That he died in peace (1489) was due to the

protection of influential friends whose names, were they known, should be added also to the list of Reformers. At first Lutheranism was accepted, but soon exchanged for the Reformed doctrine, which has retained its ground. In the Netherlands was the first blood shed for the cause in the martyrdom of Henry Voes and John Esch, at Brussels, July 1, 1523. From that date persecution continued in those provinces through all the reign of Charles V., and with more terrible infatuation under his successor, Philip II. Between 1532 and 1538 the Protestant cause was greatly strengthened by the accession of Würtemberg, of Pomerania, of the count palatine, the princes of Anhalt, William of Nassau and many free cities, as well as the kingdoms of Denmark (1536) and Norway (1537).

Meanwhile, urgent and repeated demand had been made for the calling of the General Council to which Protestants had appealed. The popes had deferred that action until the work which it was expected to do was no longer practicable, and until the Protestants no longer took much interest in it. A bull was issued convoking the council at Mantua. With a view to it, Luther drew up a statement of doctrine, which was accepted by the Protestant League at Smalcald in February, 1537. It is known as "the Smalcald Articles." The council did not meet.

July 10, 1538, the Holy League was formed at Nuremberg for the purpose of sustaining the imperial authorities in carrying the edict of Augsburg into execution. War between the two parties seemed to be inevitable, but at that juncture the Turk again threatened the eastern borders of the empire. Peace must

be kept with the Protestants some time longer ; imperial negotiations with them at Frankfort-on-the-M in (1539) resulted in suspending all proceedings against them for eighteen months. After the termination of the Frankfort suspension various other diets and conferences were held to settle the differences of opinion, but without effect.

The urgently-demanded council at last assembled at Trent, December 13, 1545. At that juncture Luther died, at Eisleben, the place of his birth, February 16, 1546. Very soon it became plain that the council would not answer the end for which it was called—that its purpose was not to conciliate, but to condemn, the Protestants.

The emperor opened a conference at Ratisbon, January 27, 1546 ; that also failed. Being now in condition to apply force, he undertook to make a reformation on his own terms, which Protestants were to be constrained to accept. They resisted, but their confederation, the Smalcald League, conducted the war feebly, and was constrained to submit after the battle of Muhlberg, April 24, 1547.

At a diet opened by the emperor at Augsburg (September, 1547) a compromise between the Catholic and the Protestant religion was agreed upon as an *interim*, or temporary measure, until the action of a proper council could be obtained. Though accepted by some of the Protestant princes, by the states and populations generally, it was condemned ; but military force imposed it. In a few months pure Protestantism was suppressed in Germany ; the city of Magdeburg alone openly maintained it.

That success of the imperial arms was brought to a sudden termination. Maurice of Saxony, who a few years before had deserted the Protestant league to join the emperor and was trusted with command of a large force, becoming disgusted with the service in which he was employed and indignant at the imperial despotism, suddenly turned from Magdeburg, which he had been sent to reduce, and directed his arms against his master. Charles lay sick at Innspruck, and learned of his danger only in time to escape capture by a rapid flight. He was constrained (August 2, 1552) to sign a treaty granting freedom of religion to the Protestant states until a new council could be convened. Maurice also secured the co-operation of the king of France, who prosecuted the war by invading the emperor's possessions in the Netherlands. It was at some sacrifice that Charles secured a not dishonorable peace with his enemies on all sides. The act of settlement for Germany was concluded at the diet of Augsburg (September 25, 1555) in granting to the Protestant religion, without limitation of time, a recognized place, and to the German states freedom of choice between the two religions.

One month later Charles V. abdicated the throne of the Netherlands, and a few weeks afterward that of Spain, with all its dependencies, in favor of his son Philip. The crown of the empire he retained six months longer. But when he had transferred all his claims of allegiance from Germany to his brother Ferdinand, the greatest monarch of his age withdrew from public life and buried himself in a monastery. Although courtesy made use of his august name as

long as he lived, he never again appeared in the world.

Freedom of religious profession was allowed by the Peace of Augsburg only to governments: the people were expected to follow the religion selected for them by their rulers, although they were free to remove to a state where that of their choice was established. Religious liberty was further fettered by a stipulation that every prince-prelate, passing over to the cause of Protestantism should lose, with his ecclesiastical prerogatives, his temporal power and dominion also.

The emperors Ferdinand I. and Maximilian II. respected the peace and made honorable efforts to hold the balance fairly between the two parties, and additions were made to the number of Protestant states.

After the death of Luther the divisions of opinion which had before existed among the theologians of his connection greatly increased. Melancthon had modified their theology on some points, such as the agency of man in conversion and the Lord's Supper. The University of Wittenberg adopted his views; subsequently, that of Jena was founded in the interest of strict Lutheranism. Various other differences arose which distracted theological opinion for several years. At last a convention met at Bergen, near Magdeburg (1577), and agreed upon a form of concord which constitutes the final symbol of the Lutheran Church.

The Jesuit order received papal sanction in 1540, and Ignatius Loyola died in 1556, after having completed his system and seen it fully established. Loyola was a Spanish soldier who, being disabled for military service by wounds, became enthusiastically relig-

ious and turned his attention to the construction of a new monastic order for the specific purpose of defending the papal cause, rolling back the Reformation and suppressing all dissent. His plans were gradually matured by the thinking of many years and the assistance of colleagues, among whom the first were Peter Faber and Francis Xavier. The order, calling itself "the Society of Jesus," sought to secure power by popular preaching, by obtaining the place of confessors to princes and persons of high rank and standing in royal courts, by controlling the education of the young and by establishing missions in heathen countries.

In proportion as the order increased in Germany, so did Catholic violation of the religious peace. The emperor Rudolph II. (1576-1612) sustained the reaction with all the weight of his authority, and in some cases with force. As the power of choosing the state religion belonged only to the rulers, little regard was paid to the wishes of the people. Success emboldened aggression; threats of entire suppression of the Protestant cause began to be heard, and in some quarters steps were taken to that end.

A change had also taken place in the tone of the Roman Catholic Church as well as in that of the papacy respecting the reformation needed within their bounds. Julius III., at the instance of Charles V., reopened the Council of Trent, May 1, 1551, but closed it in April, 1552. After his death, in 1555, Marcellus reigned only twenty-three days, and was followed by Paul IV., who, having been long at the head of the Inquisition in Rome, entered upon his pontificate in

the spirit of stern hostility to all measures of reform, and with a determination to carry to the utmost possible extreme the temporal and spiritual supremacy of the papal office. During all his reign (1555-1559) the council was not called. By the next pope, Pius IV., it was reassembled January 18, 1562, and was more numerously attended than before; but the acts of the council were of less importance, and neither then nor before did it effect anything to meet the demand for reform which had first brought it together. It, however, clearly defined the position of Romanism as over-against that of the Protestants, and made manifest the fact that reconciliation was impracticable. It was finally dissolved on the 4th of December, 1563. In all, its sessions had covered about four years and seven months. Indulgences, and all the doctrines out of which they spring and by which they are justified, were fully sustained and the practice of dispensing them was defended, while the recklessness which had brought the sale of them into disrepute was censured. They were to be dispensed, not for pay, but for piety. The works of the Council of Trent appear in the form of canons and a catechism for the instruction of priests, and after its final adjournment Pius IV. issued a confession which he pronounced part of the true and Catholic faith, out of which no one can be saved.

From the close of the Council of Trent the demand for reform within the Romish Church fell into disrepute, and the reaction against it continued to gain strength, until the very name "reformation" was held equivalent to "heresy." For that change the Romish Church is indebted chiefly to the Council of Trent and the Jesuit

order, which at the death of its founder, in 1556, consisted of one thousand active agents and one hundred religious houses, divided into twelve provinces, reaching to the East Indies on one side and to Brazil on the other. It soon became a mighty engine, no less powerful among the politics of princes than in the propaganda of Romanism.

Meanwhile, the Reformed churches on the Continent had also matured their doctrinal symbols.

In 1535 and 1536, *Geneva*, sustained by the canton of Berne, succeeded in wresting her independence from her bishop and the duke of Savoy and in uniting with the Protestant confederation of Switzerland. Her Reformer, William Farel, had begun to preach there in 1532; driven away by violence, he returned next year. In 1536 he was joined by John Calvin, who had already published the first edition of his *Institutes of Theology*. On account of the strictness of their discipline, these men were banished from the city. Farel subsequently labored in Neufchâtel; Calvin went to Strasburg, but was recalled in 1541 by the urgent entreaty of the people of Geneva, with the promise that they would accept the religious government which he proposed. Under the regulations thus established Geneva became the head of the Helvetic Reformation and the seminary of Reformed doctrine. After the death of Calvin, May 27, 1564, the theology and standing of these Reformers were maintained by Beza and other eminent scholars and divines.

In France the Reformed, under severe repression, and sometimes the most cruel persecution, continued to increase in number, and in 1559 drew up their Con-

fession consistent with the doctrines taught in Geneva. Their cause was sustained by the prince of Condé, the admiral Coligny and the queen of Navarre, and later by her son, Henry, king of Navarre. At the head of the Roman Catholic party stood the ducal house of Lorraine and the royal family of France, led by the policy of Catherine de' Medici, wife of Henry II. and mother of the three following kings. After repeated wars, a marriage of the young king of Navarre and the sister of Charles IX. was negotiated as a means of securing peace. Great numbers of Protestants assembled in Paris to honor the nuptials of their leader; they were attacked on the night of the 24th of August (St. Bartholomew's day), 1572, and murdered, to the number of many thousands. The orders for the massacre were extended to the provinces, where they were also obeyed. But, so far from being exterminated, the Reformed of France rallied around the king of Navarre and carried him in victory to the walls of Paris. Succeeding to the throne of France in 1589, and in the hope of uniting both parties, he deserted his friends by professing the creed of his enemies. He granted to Protestants equal rights with Catholics by the edict of Nantes (1598), but his own family were subjected to Romish education, to their ultimate moral ruin, and the real liberties of Protestants did not long survive his death, which occurred by assassination in 1610.

Among the Reformed of the Netherlands, persecution, begun in the execution of the first martyrs of Brussels, in 1523, was continued with varying severity through all the reign of Charles V., and under his

successor, Philip II., intensified to a degree which was equally inhuman and insane, resulting in the reduction to poverty of a once wealthy dependency and the complete alienation of a part of it from the throne of Spain. In 1579 the southern provinces submitted, but the northern declared their independence and maintained their Reformed religion. In 1561 the Belgic Confession was composed, presenting the same type of doctrine as that of Geneva. On that platform the republicans of the United Netherlands defended themselves against the forces of Spain, and after a long war wrested from their enemy the peace of 1609; then rose the controversy with Arminianism, leading to the National Synod of Dort, in 1618.

Again the provinces were involved in a war with Spain, beginning in 1621, in the course of which they were brought into relations with the Protestants of Germany in the Thirty Years' war.

Among German Protestants several princes and states passed over from Lutheranism to the Reformed communion, such as the duchy of Lippe, Hesse-Cassel and the Hanse city of Bremen; but, of all German Reformed states, most eminent was the Palatinate, which made the change under the elector Frederick III. in 1560. Three years afterward, under the same prince, the Heidelberg Catechism was published, which soon became the common standard of doctrine for the churches of that connection and of Holland.

A sense of the danger to which they were exposed by the machinations of Jesuits and the spirit of perse-

cution, which was exhibiting itself more and more extensively, led the Protestant states of Germany to enter into another league for their mutual defence. Thus was formed the Evangelical Union, at Ahausen, in May, 1608. An opposing Roman Catholic league was constituted, in July of the next year, at Munich. At the head of the former was the elector Frederick IV. of the Palatinate, and of the latter Maximilian of Bavaria.

In Bohemia the Reformers were the most numerous part of the population, but the religious peace was of little benefit to them, because they were subjects of a Catholic German prince and dependent upon his strictness or liberality. Upon the death of the emperor Matthias, who had been their king, the Bohemians resisted his successor on the imperial throne, Ferdinand II., as being an intolerant Romanist, and offered their crown to Frederick V., the young prince of the Palatinate and son-in-law of James I. of England. Ferdinand pursued his claim by war, and was supported by Spain and the Catholic league. Bohemia and the Palatinate, driven to self-defence, looked for support from the Evangelical Union and from England. Thus opened in 1618 a war which, though sometimes interrupted for a brief space, was not brought to a close until after the lapse of thirty years, and in the prosecution of which some of the finest portions of Germany were trodden into desolation.

The aid expected by the elector from England proved so feeble as to be deceitful. Ferdinand was victorious (1620). Protestant worship was abolished in Bohemia. The same fate befell Austria. The lands

of the Palatinate were seized by Spain and Maximilian. The Evangelical Union was dissolved, and the first act of the war terminated in the forcible re-establishment of the Roman Catholic religion everywhere. In 1625 an attempt was made by the Protestants of Lower Saxony, under command of Christian IV., king of Denmark, to resist that oppression; it also issued in defeat by the imperial forces under Tilly and Wallenstein. A treaty was concluded at Lubeck, May 12, 1629. The long-suspended edict was put in execution, and nothing less was contemplated than extermination of the Protestant cause.

But the completeness of imperial success brought about its overthrow. Such a preponderance of the Austro-Spanish power kindled the jealousy, if not the reasonable fears, of France. The Italian princes, including the pope, from various motives of local politics, sympathized with France. An alliance was accordingly formed by those powers, together with Sweden, for the purpose of pursuing the war more vigorously, to put a check upon the dangerously overbalancing weight of the Hapsburg dynasty. The new campaign opened June 24, 1630, with the arrival of Gustavus Adolphus, king of Sweden, as commander of the allied armies in Germany. By his prudence and energy he inspired the minds of Protestants with new hopes, which were fully sustained by his military success. On the 7th of September, 1631, he fought a great battle, in which he defeated Count Tilly at Leipsic and cleared his way into the heart of Germany. Early next year he again defeated the imperial forces, at the passage of the Lech, where Count Tilly was

slain. Continuing his victorious march southward, he penetrated into Bavaria, breaking, as he advanced, the fetters which the emperor had been so industriously riveting upon his Protestant subjects. In another great battle, at Lützen, November 6, 1632, he defeated the forces of Wallenstein. By these victories he removed the oppression which rested upon most of the German states, thereby enlarging his own resources as he weakened those of his enemy; and, although he fell, in the midst of victory, at Lützen, the change he had effected upon the relative state of the belligerents gave to the cause he defended an advantage which was retained to the end. His policy was pursued by the Swedish minister Oxenstiern, and the Swedish generals Banier and Torstensen and the prince of Saxe-Weimar wrested repeated victory from the imperialist forces; while Spain, already reduced by her losses in the Netherlands, was humiliated by the victories of the French generals Condé, Turenne and others. It was a long conflict, in which the reverses were not all on one side, but which issued in such decided advantage to the Protestant cause as to constrain their enemy to reasonable terms. The Thirty Years' war closed in the Peace of Westphalia by the treaties of August and October, 1648.

Sweden and some other Protestant states made a gain of territory, and only in Bavaria were the Catholics allowed to retain all the advantages they had conquered in the early part of the war. The terrible oppression of Bohemia could not be undone. The principal gain was in the establishment of equality between Roman Catholic and Protestant states in all

affairs of empire. And, as Holland had been one of the members of the alliance, the conditions of the treaty extended to both branches of the Protestant connection.

Among the *Confessions* called forth during this long period of conflict, the most important are, for the *Lutheran Church*, Luther's two Catechisms, Longer and Shorter, the Augsburg Confession, the Apology for the Confession, the Smalcald Articles and the Form of Concord; for the *Reformed*, the second Basil Confession (or first Helvetic), Calvin's *Institutes*, though not a confession, yet having much to do with all the Reformed confessions which succeeded, Consensus Tigurinus, by which German Switzerland accepted Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper, the second Helvetic Confession, the Heidelberg Catechism, the Gallic Confession, the Belgic Confession, and the Confession and Canons of Dort.

By the same date the English Church Articles had received their final form and the work of the Westminster Assembly was complete.

Efforts were also made for reform in the Greek Church, and patriarchs of Constantinople took the lead. Jeremiah II. corresponded with the Tübingen theologians (1573), but his Church rejected Lutheranism. Another patriarch, Cyril Lucaris, who labored for admission of Calvinism, met a fiercer opposition intensified by machination of Jesuits with the civil power, ending in his death (1638). The Russian Reformer, Nikon, never dared so much, yet died in banishment. Peter Mogilas limited himself to education, the press and popular statement of the best part of Greek faith in the "Orthodox Confession."

CHAPTER III.

REFORMATION IN THE BRITISH ISLES.

REFORMATION began in England with the dawn of English literature under Wycliff and his illustrious compeers. In the reign of Richard II. persecution was held under restraint; but when, in 1399, that monarch was deposed, Henry IV., to secure support for his usurpation, extended every favor to the priesthood. In January, 1401, Parliament passed a law that persons convicted of heresy should be burned to death. Thomas Arundel, archbishop of Canterbury, forthwith carried the law into execution; its first victim, William Sautre, was burned in February. Arundel died in 1414, and was followed by Henry Chicheley. Persecution relaxed during the civil wars, when all the energies of the ruling parties were absorbed in the strife with each other. Meanwhile, reunion of the papacy and condemnation of Wycliff's doctrines by the Council of Constance broke the political support of his followers. Disorganized and without a leader, they awaited in silence more favorable times for a renewed profession of their faith.

When reform on the Continent began to assert its independence, many in England were prepared to join it. Henry VIII. endeavored to repress those convic-

tions, and in opposition to Luther published a treatise in defence of the seven sacraments of Rome. It was highly lauded by the pope, who rewarded its author with the title "Defender of the Faith." On the other hand, an event in the king's own household led to a rupture of his papal allegiance. He had been married at an early age to his brother's widow, Catherine of Aragon, maternal aunt of the emperor Charles V. The contract was formed by his father, as a measure of state policy and under a dispensation from Pope Julius II., when Henry was only twelve years old. But with its validity the young prince was never satisfied; as early as 1527 he made application to Pope Clement VII. to have it declared invalid. The pope delayed. In 1530, at the suggestion of Thomas Cranmer, the king consulted the learned men in the great universities of Europe. Nine foreign universities, together with Oxford and Cambridge, many divines in all parts of Europe and the convocation of English clergy, decided that his view of the case was in accordance with Scripture and the doctrine of the Catholic Church. The king, considering his marriage with his brother's widow null, was married to Anne Boleyn on the 25th of January, 1533. The pope gave judgment against him and endeavored to enforce his censure. The king asserted the correctness of his own conduct, as sustained by higher authority than that of the pope, appealed to the next General Council, and forthwith took measures to exclude papal interference from his dominions.

In 1534, Henry was himself recognized as head of the English Church. Still, it was no part of his design

to follow the example of the continental Reformers. He had debarred the papal authority from England, but was not disposed to tolerate any change in religion. Both Protestants and papalists¹ suffered at his hands; a great number of monastic houses were suppressed and their estates transferred to the Crown. But the national hierarchy was retained, with the Romish forms of worship and the Romish doctrine. In 1539 an act was passed for "abolishing diversity of opinion in religion," and a list of six articles, comprehending the strong points of Romanism, was published, which all Englishmen were to be compelled to accept. Nothing but the real Protestantism widely diffused among his clergy and people rendered the measures of Henry VIII. a step of reformation. Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury from 1533, was an earnest Reformer, and yet retained the king's favor.

A translation of the New Testament directly from the Greek into the English by William Tyndale was printed in Flanders in 1526, and the Old Testament translated by him from the Hebrew was printed with it at Hamburg in 1532. Three years later Tyndale suffered death for heresy. In 1535, Miles Coverdale published at Zurich that edition of the whole Bible which was the first allowed in England by royal authority. In 1536 an injunction was issued to the clergy to provide a "copy of the Bible in Latin and one in English, and lay them in the choir of every parish church in the realm, for every man, who chose,

¹ By papalists I mean defenders of the pope in his controversy with the king.

to read therein, and directing that none should be discouraged from reading, but rather exhorted so to do."

Another edition of the English Bible was printed on the Continent in 1537, bearing the name of Thomas Matthew. Archbishop Cranmer moved in convocation to present a petition to the king for permission to prepare another translation. Queen Anne Boleyn used her influence with the king, and the permission was granted. The new version, executed by different scholars, was brought out in 1539 with a preface by Cranmer, and is commonly called "Cranmer's Great Bible." In the same year another translation, or revision, by Richard Taverner, was published in London.

The Romish party used every effort to obstruct the progress thus made, and so far prevailed with Parliament as to obtain the passing of an act forbidding the use of Tyndale's version and allowing the others only under severe restriction. Yet the translations were bought and read with avidity by many persons of all ranks.

A kindred work for the Reformation was done soon afterward in a metrical version of the Psalms. Thomas Sternhold, moved with disgust at the licentious songs of the day, like Marot in France, prepared several of the Psalms to take their place. He versified forty-one; John Hopkins added fifty-eight, and the work was completed by various hands. These Psalms were introduced into the service of the Church gradually.

Henry VIII. died January 28, 1547. The heir of

the crown, Edward VI., was a minor educated in the Protestant faith. In his brief reign, from 1547 to 1553, the best part of the English Reformation was effected. The system of doctrine adopted was that of the Reformed churches on the Continent. A similar change in Church government was contemplated, and, had Edward VI. seen a longer life, it would probably have been made; but his death was followed by the furious Romanist reaction under Mary, and the policy of Elizabeth was to accept the Reformation and to restrain it to the stage at which Edward left it. By that means the movement was greatly retarded and divided within itself.

Catholic England was ecclesiastically divided into the two provinces of Canterbury and York, the provinces into dioceses, and these into parishes and other cures of various designations; each diocese was governed by a bishop; the archbishops of York and Canterbury stood at the head of their respective provinces; Canterbury was the primate of the kingdom; and the supremacy over all rested in the hands of the pope. It was the last of these authorities alone which was changed by the schism of Henry VIII.

Bishops were empowered to call councils of their respective dioceses, and archbishops of their provinces. From early time the kings adopted the practice of requiring the archbishops to convoke their clergy in meetings connected with Parliament for the purpose of voting the taxes to be paid by the clergy and the exercise of other temporal functions. These were called "convocations," of which there was one for each province, that of Canterbury being the superior. Having

also the right of exercising spiritual functions, convocations gradually usurped the place of purely ecclesiastical synods and became the sole provincial synods of England, meeting at the same time with Parliament.

DOCTRINAL REFORMATION IN ENGLAND.

(1547-1553.)

Under Edward VI. convocation and Parliament cooperated in reform of doctrine and worship. Early in that reign curates were instructed to take down from their churches images that had been objects of worship, the keeping of an English Bible in some convenient part of the church for the people to read was re-enforced and the restrictions were repealed. All persons in the lower ranks of the clergy were ordered to possess the New Testament, in both Latin and English, with the paraphrase of Erasmus, upon which they were to be examined by the bishops in their visitations and synods. They were also ordered to read portions of it before their congregations on Sundays and other holy days. A catechism for general use and twelve homilies for aid of the clergy were drawn up by Cranmer or under his direction. A general visitation of the kingdom by commissioners appointed by the Crown was instituted for the purpose of inquiring into doctrine and conduct of the clergy, and of furnishing instructions for worship and the regulation of the parishes.

Parliament, assembled November 4, 1547, began by repealing all statutes against heretics, including the odious "Six Articles." It was now enacted that the mass should give place to the communion, and that

the sacrament should be administered to all communicants under both kinds. The remaining monastic houses were suppressed and their revenues put into the king's hands, to be expended in erecting grammar schools, in further augmenting the universities and in making better provision for the poor.

Commissioners appointed to draw up a book of common prayer assembled at Windsor, May 9, 1548. The new liturgy was presented to convocation, which met in November, and, having been agreed to by that body, was brought into Parliament, where a law was passed that from Whitsunday, June 10, 1549, "all divine offices should be performed according to it."

In 1551 a committee was appointed to draw up a system of ecclesiastical laws, under which the archbishop prepared a list of forty-two articles of religion for "maintaining peace and unity of doctrine in the Church." They were published in 1553, having received the approval of convocation and the royal assent. A shorter catechism containing the "sum of Christian learning" was issued in Latin and English the same year. The body of ecclesiastical laws was completed, but not soon enough to receive the sanction of the king.

A revised edition of the Prayer-Book was authorized by the Parliament of 1532, which also declared the marriage of the clergy to be legal. Alterations were made in the ecclesiastical vestments, which some proposed to reject altogether.

These changes were not made without opposition: Bishops Gardiner of Winchester and Bonner of London resisted with most obstinacy. The latter sub-

mitted under protest, and the former was imprisoned. In some parts of the country the Romanist population expressed their discontent by rising in rebellion which had to be put down by authority or by arms.

In addition to all that was done by the Parliament and the convocation of England, it was designed by Cranmer to have a synod called of theologians representing all the churches of the Reformation, with a view to mutual support and harmony of doctrine. He corresponded on the subject with both Lutherans and Reformed, but ere the plan could be matured the whole work of reformation was suspended in England by the death of the king, Edward VI., on the 5th of July, 1553,

CATHOLIC REACTION.

(1553-1558.)

The next heir to the throne was King Edward's oldest sister, Mary, daughter of Catherine of Aragon, who had been educated in strict adherence to the Church of Rome. The attempt of the earl of Northumberland to set up a rival candidate, in the person of Lady Jane Grey, failed, and involved the principal persons concerned with it in ruin.

The people of England at that time consisted of three parties: first, that which advocated the right of the pope to full ecclesiastical dominion, with all that it implied—a party which was very small; second, a moderate reforming party, which rejected the papacy, dependency upon Rome and the monastic orders, but preferred the old Creed, the old forms of worship and the national priesthood: it also included

a large number of that class of property-holders who had shared in the confiscated lands of the monasteries; the third was that of the thoroughgoing Reformers. The second was more numerous than both the other two, and was that which hailed the accession of Mary with rejoicing, in the hope that she would restore the state of things as it stood in the latter years of her father. It was also the party which, when disappointed by her restoration of the papal supremacy, persecution and attempts to restore the monasteries, ultimately revolted against her and gave its support to the Protestant party.

Mary at first evinced no disposition to cruelty, but her purpose to sustain the extreme papal party appeared in her deposing the reforming bishops and putting strong Romanists in their room. Gardiner was made chancellor of the kingdom and Bonner bishop of London. Ridley, Coverdale and Hooper were sent to prison, where Cranmer soon after followed them. Many others were treated in the same manner, and a proclamation was issued, August 18, 1553, by which all preachers were silenced except those who should receive license from the queen, by whom the whole authority on that matter was transferred to Gardiner; those who refused to comply were sent to prison. Many, foreseeing the fate which awaited them, fled to the Continent. So precipitately was the change effected that when Parliament met, October 5, 1553, three months after the death of King Edward, only two Protestant bishops appeared in their places. The queen communicated to the pope her recognition of his supremacy, and

her kinsman, Cardinal Pole, was appointed legate to reconcile the kingdom to the Roman see.

In order to fortify the Romish interest in England and on the Continent, as well as to serve the ambition of the emperor Charles V., marriage was by him negotiated between his son Philip and the queen of England; it took place on the 25th of July, 1554. Philip resided in England about fourteen months, after which he went into the Netherlands to be present at his father's abdication and to receive the crown of Spain and her dependencies.

November 24, 1554, England was formally reconciled to the pope, and measures were taken to enforce his authority. The leader in that progress was the queen, but her oracle and instigator was Cardinal Pole, and the prime agent in procuring the action of Parliament in their favor was Bishop Gardiner. The laws of Edward's reign touching religion and the ecclesiastical acts of Henry VIII. were repealed, and by the beginning of January, 1555, the legal powers of persecution were fully re-established.

In February, 1555, John Rogers, prebendary of St. Paul's, was burned at the stake in Smithfield for receiving the sacrament according to the liturgy of Edward VI. Five days after, Hooper, bishop of Gloucester, was committed to the flames in the city of Gloucester. Then followed in rapid succession victim after victim, among whom were Ridley, formerly bishop of London, Latimer, bishop of Worcester, Ferrars, bishop of St. David's, and others, the most conspicuous in the Church, with many of humbler rank. These executions took place chiefly at Smithfield, in London, but also

at Oxford, Canterbury and elsewhere. Cranmer was retained in prison until March 21, 1556, when he was burned at Oxford; on the next day Cardinal Pole was made archbishop of Canterbury. Gardiner had died on the 12th of November preceding.

From the execution of Rogers, February 4, 1555, until the last victims at Canterbury, November 10, 1558, not less than two hundred and seventy persons perished in the flames. Bad management of the government in other respects and failure of the national arms abroad increased the general discontent. Several insurrections had been attempted, and a more general movement seemed on the point of breaking out, as appeared from the threatening temper of the House of Commons, which met November 5, 1558. Mary's death a few days afterward (November 17) allayed the ferment and put an end to papal domination in England. Sixteen hours later Cardinal Pole, the chief instigator of the persecution, died also. The last victims of the stake had suffered at Canterbury only seven days before.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE ENGLISH PROTESTANT CHURCH.
(1558-1563.)

The accession of Elizabeth, daughter of Queen Anne Boleyn, filled the hearts of Protestants and anti-papal Catholics with joy. She was of a superior intellect, well educated, and now five and twenty years of age. Her first royal act was to order the release of all persons imprisoned for religion's sake. All preaching was suspended until the meeting of Parliament; only the Church service and the reading of the

Scriptures were allowed. No alterations were to be made except by an act of the nation.

The policy of Elizabeth was to restrain the Reformation to the stage at which it had arrived when Edward died, and in that shape to constitute it the Church of England. It was not presumed that any save extreme papalists would be dissenters. She rested her right to the crown upon her father's will. She graciously received all the bishops except Bonner of London, whose brutality had made him disreputably conspicuous in the persecution. For her council she selected from both Protestants and national Catholics; the former alone were retained permanently. Among them were Sir William Cecil, afterward Lord Burleigh, secretary of state, and Nicholas Bacon, keeper of the great seal. By Cecil the safety and quiet of the realm were secured by the wisest and most expeditious measures.

The queen was crowned on the 15th of January, 1559. Parliament met ten days after. The royal supremacy was restored and papal dominion excluded from the kingdom. Supremacy was explained as, "under God, the sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons within the realm of England, both ecclesiastical and temporal, so as no foreign power should have superiority over them." Matthew Parker, an advanced Protestant, was made archbishop of Canterbury. The law of Henry VIII. for the election of bishops was revived, also those passed in the reign of Edward VI. for the reformation of religion. The monastic houses founded or restored by Mary were suppressed, and their property was annexed to the Crown. Most

of the monks returned to secular life, but the nuns withdrew to Catholic countries.

The queen was empowered to appoint a commission consisting of either churchmen or laymen for the settlement of ecclesiastical causes; from that—called “the High-Commission Court”—there was to be no appeal. By the Act of Uniformity all church service was to be conducted according to the second liturgy of Edward VI., with a few alterations then introduced, the alterations being mostly backward to the readoption of what had been rejected as Romish in forms of worship and sacerdotal habits.

Convocation, which met at the same time with Parliament and was still predominantly Romish, drew up and presented to the lord-keeper six articles designed to maintain the state of things as constituted in the reign of Mary. A conference was appointed between the Reformed and the Romish divines, eight on each side; it issued in only a conviction that the two were irreconcilable. When the session of Parliament had closed, the oath of supremacy was tendered to all the bishops, and refused by all except the bishop of Llandaff. The parish clergy were of a different mind, and, with but few exceptions, joined the Reformation. Of nine thousand four hundred beneficed clergymen under Mary's reign, only one hundred and ninety-two refused the oath of supremacy, and of these only eighty were rectors of churches; the rest were bishops, deans, archdeacons and other dignitaries. No penalty was imposed upon any of them except three—Bonner of London, with his partners in cruelty, White, bishop of Winchester, and Watson of Lincoln. Bonner was

imprisoned for life; the other two were imprisoned for a time, then released. A pension was assigned them, upon which they withdrew from the country. The next convocation was Protestant.

A church visitation like that of Edward VI. was appointed. The instructions on this occasion were specially addressed to the order of public worship and the style of church music, enjoining "that it be simple and plain."

Archbishop Parker found some difficulty in filling the vacant sees, from the fact that the most competent clergy had arrived at views of reformation too far advanced for the queen's purpose. Such was really his own state, and he had accepted episcopal office only in compliance with the royal command.

A short profession of faith was drawn up, consisting of eleven articles setting forth clearly the peculiar attitude of the Anglican Church. Also a new translation of the Bible, made by certain English and Scottish refugees in Geneva, was printed in 1562.

Convocation of 1563 assembled specially for the settlement of doctrine and discipline. The basis adopted was that of the Forty-two Articles; of these, four were now omitted, and some of the rest were altered with a bearing to a more complete reform. The first book of homilies had been reprinted in 1560; the second, which had also been prepared, in whole or in part, before the death of Edward, was now printed for the first time (1563). Some years afterward the Articles of Religion were again revised, another article, the XXIXth, added, making in all thirty-nine, and thus were ratified by convocation, May 11,

1571. A defence of the English Church was prepared by Bishop Jewel. Being designed for theologians generally, it was written in Latin, and with the sanction of convocation was published in 1563.

CONTROVERSY OF PURITAN AND EPISCOPALIAN TO THE
END OF ELIZABETH'S REIGN.

(1563-1603.)

Already the Puritan element was strong in the English Church. When the subject of rites and ceremonies came to be treated by convocation, several papers were introduced proposing a more thorough change. Many of the members were disposed to go the length of excluding all sacerdotal vestments, organs, saints' days, lay-baptism and the obligation of kneeling at the Eucharist. To those who thus advocated a more complete reformation the name "Puritan" was in course of time generally applied.

A new revision of the Bible was brought out in 1568. It is called "the Bishops' Bible," as having been prepared chiefly by the English bishops under the supervision of Archbishop Parker. For forty years it held the place of authority in the public service of the English Church, while the Genevan Bible was used in Scotland, and generally by the Puritans of England in private.

So far all varieties of opinion, from Romanist to Puritan, were comprehended within the pale of the one national Church, but the extremes were soon to drop off, and the forcible means employed to retain them accelerated the separation. The breach was first made with the more advanced Puritans. In church service

many Romish forms were still enforced, the hierarchy was still unaltered except in as far as disconnected with Rome, and some of the Romish vestments were still canonical. In all these respects a number of the clergy desired and expected a further reform; many had of their own freedom disused the vestments before the canons were passed which enforced the wearing of them. A matter of previously little moment now involved a question of principle.

By one of those canons all licenses to preach granted before March 1, 1564, were declared void, and those who were thought qualified for the office of preaching were to be admitted again by a new license, and that was granted only under a promise of conformity in dresses and in ceremonies. Many of the best ministers were thereby turned out of their places and many congregations left destitute. Among the displaced was Miles Coverdale. For a time he continued to preach in private houses; his example was followed by other ministers, whose services were attended by considerable numbers of their respective congregations. After the lapse of a few months, seeing no hope from the leniency of the government, they resolved entirely to break off their connection with the national establishment and to organize themselves as congregations on a Presbyterian model. This took place in 1566. Government tried to prevent it, but the dissenters increased in number, and four years later (November 20, 1572), at Wandsworth, in the neighborhood of London, organized their congregations into a Presbytery.

In the end of the year 1568 a Roman Catholic insurrection occurred with the view of putting Mary of

Scotland on the throne of England; the papal excommunication of Elizabeth followed soon after (1569). A more strongly-marked distinction between Catholic and Protestant was the effect, and the adherents of Rome could no longer attend the services of a Church which recognized an excommunicated head. That act of the pope made his adherents thenceforward dissenters in England. In the same year a Romish college for Englishmen and for operation upon England was established at Douay, in the Netherlands, under patronage of Philip II. of Spain.

Instead of making the queen more indulgent to her loyal Protestant subjects, these events urged her to greater stringency in carrying out the law of uniformity. At that very date "Bridewell and other prisons were full of Puritans." All her subjects were ordered to attend service and communion in the Established Church. In Parliament (1571) an effort was made by the Commons for relief of the Puritans, but was suppressed by interference of royal authority. By far the greater number of the Puritans were still in connection with the Established Church and seeking its further reformation. About 1569 they were strengthened by the accession of the Rev. Thomas Cartwright, professor of divinity in the University of Cambridge, who with great learning and eloquence unfolded in his lectures the errors of the Established Church and advocated their removal. When challenged for nonconformity, he offered to hold a public disputation on the points in question. This was declined, but he was forbidden to continue his lectures, and was soon after, contrary to the advice of the secretary of state, deprived of his

fellowship by the authorities of the university and expelled.

The Puritan party in the Church objected to the hierarchy and certain evils connected with it; to the law which confined public worship to prescribed forms; to various observances retained from Romish practice, but without sanction from Scripture; and to the use of clerical vestments. They held that Scripture is the only standard of religion, and that every man has a right to read and to judge of it for himself.

Archbishop Parker died May 17, 1575; he was succeeded by Grindal, who, insisting upon carrying the improvement and efficiency of his clergy beyond the measure assigned by the queen, was in 1577 suspended from office. The primacy remained virtually vacant until his death, in 1583; Whitgift was then put into it, and, holding firmly to the queen's policy of uniformity, retained it through her reign.

Notwithstanding the severity with which they were treated, the Puritans continued to increase in numbers, and every effort to draw the reins of uniformity tighter upon the Church drove more of them out of it. Many of the Established ministers took refuge in associations for mutual improvement, which were called "Prophe-syings of the Clergy." They soon proved, like other opportunities of free expression in England in those days, seminaries of Puritan views. The archbishop received instruction from the queen to suppress them.

Among the exiles from the Established Church was Robert Brown, a preacher of some popular power, who collected a congregation on principles of his own.

It was broken up, and he, with several of his friends and followers, went to Holland, where, at Middleburg, in Zeeland, they formed the first congregation of Independents, called, in the first instance, "Brownists." In 1589, Brown returned to England and accepted a rectorship in the Establishment.

Shortly before the death of Elizabeth two other separate congregations were formed, under better auspices, and soon afterward a wiser leader was found in John Robinson. Persecution in England constrained many of them also to seek refuge in Holland. Their number increased, and under the prudent advice of Mr. Robinson their Church polity began to look toward a more organic structure than that of independency. Residence in a country where they were cut off from the people by the barrier of a foreign language, together with other objections, in a few years led them to seek for some abode more favorable to future prosperity and spiritual freedom. That project issued in 1620 in the celebrated emigration of the Puritan Pilgrims to America.

In England the Puritans were still, for the most part, members of the Established Church and differed considerably in opinion, but all looked more or less to the model of the Reformed churches on the Continent.

Amidst a long-continued turmoil of conflicting interests, political, military, religious and personal, in which the safety of England was secured mainly by a judicious balancing of the jealousies of France and Spain, the Church of England received the characteristic features of its worship and polity. Its doctrine had been determined in the reign of Edward. Its pe-

cularities among Protestants are its royal supremacy, its episcopal order of ministers, its recognition of the legislative power of the Church in spiritual things, the enforcing of sacerdotal vestments and its liturgy.

The death of Elizabeth occurred on the 24th of March, 1603, ending the dynasty of the house of Tudor. The nearest heir to the throne of England was the king of Scots, son of the unfortunate Mary Stuart.

CHAPTER IV.

REFORMATION IN SCOTLAND.

(1528-1560.)

WHAT Staupitz was in Saxony, Wytttenbach in Switzerland and John Wessel in Holland, such in Scotland was John Major, professor of philosophy and theology in St. Andrews. Major was born in 1469, studied at Oxford, Cambridge and Paris, and, having held the professorship of theology in Glasgow several years, was in 1523 removed to the corresponding chair in St. Andrews, where he subsequently held the office of provost of the university, and died in 1550. Among other bold doctrines, he taught that the authority of princes was derived from the people and that a General Council was superior to a pope; he denied the temporal supremacy of the pope and that papal excommunication had any force when denounced without sufficient reasons; he censured the vices of the hierarchy and of the papal court and advised the reduction of monasteries.

It was at St. Andrews, while John Major was in his best days, that a number of young men afterward to be leaders in the coming revolution were prepared for their work. Eminent in that group were Henry Balnaves, afterward a statesman, George Buchanan, a

teacher and man of letters, Patrick Hamilton and John Knox.

Patrick Hamilton was a youth of noble birth whose education, conducted at St. Andrews, was further prosecuted at Wittenberg and Marburg. He was the first to preach Protestant doctrine in Scotland. Arrested by Beaton, archbishop of St. Andrews, he was tried for heresy, and burned at the stake February 28, 1528, when he had reached only the twenty-fourth year of his age.

John Knox, to whom the Scottish Reformation owes more than to any other, was born in 1505. Having previously studied under John Major at Glasgow, he entered the University of St. Andrews in 1524, at the same time with Buchanan, under the same instructors and in the same college—that of St. Salvador. Both early excelled in the scholastic learning of the course and early became dissatisfied with it. For some years after he became master of arts Knox continued to teach philosophy in the university. In 1530, or shortly before, he was ordained priest, but did not preach, preferring to remain in the office of teaching. Meanwhile, his studies led him to the early Fathers, among whom he was particularly attracted by Jerome and Augustin, and by them was led to the Holy Scriptures in the original tongues; but not until 1542 does it appear that he professed himself on the side of the Reformation. He then left St. Andrews and retired to the southern part of the kingdom, where he found protection with two wealthy gentlemen, who employed him to educate their sons. In 1544 he attached himself to the preaching of George Wishart, who had just

returned from England and the Continent richly laden with learning and with the doctrines of the Reformation, and also possessed of fervent piety, a most persuasive eloquence and an unflinching courage in the cause of truth. In 1546, Wishart was arrested at the instance of Cardinal Beaton, tried for heresy and condemned to the flames; the sentence was executed on the following day, March 1, 1546. Retribution followed fast. The cardinal was beyond the reach of law. Certain persons, too rashly following the dictates of natural revenge, seized the castle of St. Andrews, where he resided, and put him to death March 29, 1546.

Persecution was now quickened in its turn. Knox, with several others, sought protection in the castle of St. Andrews in April, 1547. It was while there that, at the call of the garrison and residents and the solemn appeal of the Reformed minister John Rough, he preached his first sermon, when he was over forty years of age. By French forces the castle was reduced, July 31; the besieged were carried to France and held as prisoners in various places. Knox, with others, was sent to the galleys; he was liberated in 1549 and immediately repaired to England, where he was employed in the Reformation under Edward VI. and assigned to preach at Berwick. At the accession of Mary of England he returned to the Continent and remained several years, enjoying the friendship of Calvin and other Reformers, and aiding in that translation of the Bible called the "Genevan." In 1555 he appeared in Scotland, but left it the next year. His final return was in May, 1559. It was followed immediately by

the events which overthrew the Roman Catholic and established the Reformed Church in Scotland.

It was not among the higher clergy of Scotland that the Reformation found its supporters, but among the presbyters, the scholars and the laity generally, both nobles and commoners. In England the narrative begins with the archbishop of Canterbury and the ecclesiastics highest in place about him; in Scotland it began with youth in the university, and was continued in the lives of scholars and of a few presbyters (priests) who felt the call to preach the gospel.

The doctrine of Patrick Hamilton was Lutheran, but as soon as the Reformed Creed was introduced it met with universal favor among the Protestants of Scotland.

On the Romish side the leader was James Beaton, archbishop of St. Andrews, upon whose death, in 1539, the same eminence was assumed by his nephew, David Beaton, also archbishop of St. Andrews and raised to the rank of cardinal, who was for the burning of George Wishart and other acts of cruelty put to death in 1546.

James IV. of Scotland in 1503 married Margaret, daughter of Henry VII. of England; ten years afterward he was slain at Flodden, when his son, James V., was only two years old. In the year when Patrick Hamilton suffered the young king, at the age of seventeen, escaped from restraint and assumed the reins himself. He had little love for the hierarchy, but never was in condition to resist it, and was sometimes constrained to the execution of its judgments. In 1538 he married Mary of Guise, daughter of the duke of

Lorraine, head of the extreme Catholic party in France.

James V. died in 1542. His daughter Mary, heir to the throne, was only a week old; James Hamilton, earl of Arran and kinsman of Patrick Hamilton, was made regent. An act of Parliament that same year made it lawful for all to read the Scriptures in their native tongue, but in a short time the regent abjured his Reformation principles. At the end of twelve years he resigned, and Mary of Guise, the queen-mother, assumed the regency.

Mary Stuart, heiress to the throne, at the age of six years was taken to France to be educated among her mother's kindred. At sixteen she was married to Francis, heir to the throne of France, to which he succeeded the next year (1559). On the ground of Mary's descent from Henry VII., the young king and queen of France and Scotland assumed also the royal title of England and were sustained by the Romanists, who denied the legitimacy of Elizabeth.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE REFORMED CHURCH IN SCOTLAND.

(1560-1592.)

The queen-regent of Scotland died June 10, 1560; her daughter, now queen of France, remained with her husband in that country. About six months later (December 4, 1560) Francis II. died, and the union of the crowns of France and Scotland came to an end. Mary did not arrive in Scotland until the 19th of August next; in the interval Parliament (August

24, 1560) had rejected Romanism, accepted the Reformed Confession, and left the Reformers free to determine their own church constitution and ministerial work. The first Assembly of the Reformed Church of Scotland met, accordingly, on the 20th of December, 1560.

Few of the clergy joined the Reformation. In the first Assembly, among forty-one members, only six were ministers of the rank of presbyters. Temporary offices had to be added to those of a permanent nature. Of the latter class, their Book of Discipline recognized the minister, or pastor, the teacher, the ruling elder and the deacon; to these, for the time then being, were added superintendents and readers. The former were not appointed for all the kingdom, but only where need required each to travel through the district assigned him, preaching and supervising the churches and schools and inspecting the conduct of the parish priests who joined them. Readers were laymen of piety and good common education who were directed simply to read the Scriptures to the people in places where preaching could not yet be provided.

The second Assembly met in Edinburgh on May 27, 1561. Queen Mary did not arrive in Scotland until August of that year; she came with the purpose to undo all that had been effected by the Reformation. Her reign utterly failed in its great aim, as it was also most unhappy for herself. General Assemblies were held regularly twice a year, and continued the improvement of discipline and authority.

The revenues which had belonged to the Romish Establishment were divided by Parliament into three

equal parts, two of which were given to support the ejected Romish clergy as long as they lived, while one third was to be divided between the queen and the Protestant clergy.

Mary's misgovernment and personal imprudences gave occasion to organized resistance, which she encountered in arms only to be defeated. She fled to England and took refuge with her cousin Elizabeth, who held her a prisoner all the rest of her days. The kingdom, in the minority of her son, was governed by regents, until the king, at twelve years of age, assumed the government himself. Thus the Scottish monarchy in the time of the Reformation was feeble and of little influence on the course of religious affairs, and that little of no benefit.

As the retired Popish bishops passed away it became necessary more permanently to dispose of their revenues. Certain of the nobility, with the earl of Morton at their head, wished to appropriate most of the amount to their own use. A plan was devised whereby, upon the death of a Catholic bishop, some submissive hireling should be put into his place to keep up the form of the office, draw the revenue of the see and pay over a part of it to the nobleman his patron, who should protect him in the enjoyment of the remainder. The method—which was called by the country people *tulchan*—succeeded only as long as enforced by the earl of Morton. The last words of John Knox to the General Assembly were leveled against it. That great leader of the Scottish Reformation died on the 24th of November, 1572.

In July, 1574, Andrew Melville returned from the

Continent; he forthwith connected himself with the party which condemned the new style of bishops and labored consistently to have every trace of diocesan episcopacy removed from the Church. By the Assembly of June, 1578, action was taken against prelacy in any shape, and it was enacted that no new bishops should be made. By the Assembly of 1580 prelacy was condemned as unscriptural, and those who held such "pretended office" were charged to demit it immediately. By the Assembly of April, 1581, a more regular distribution was made of the Church into parishes and presbyteries. A confession of faith was issued by the Assembly, subscribed by the king and published by royal proclamation.

In 1592, Parliament ratified the constitution of the Presbyterian Church as the national establishment, made permanent support of the ministry from the ecclesiastical revenues of the kingdom, and appointed General Assemblies to be held once every year, or oftener if occasion should require.

But the effect of prelacy in England toward fortifying the monarchy was an example which moved King James's love of power. In 1598 he ventured to propose a superior ecclesiastical rank by giving some of the ministers a place in Parliament with the title "bishop." Although the Assembly opposed the measure, persons were found to accept the distinction. Parliament sustained the king. A controversy arose between him and the Assembly, in the course of which he was sustained by succeeding to the throne of England. He used his augmented power to suppress the constitution of the Church of Scotland; the same

course was pursued by his successor. From 1603 until 1638 there was not one free meeting of Assembly, and those who defended the Presbyterian cause were subjected to punishment. Melville was committed to the Tower of London, and liberated only to be driven into exile. The ministry of the Church was to be constituted a prelatical hierarchy for political purposes to subserve a despotic system of kingcraft, and doctrines not conformable to that system were to be blotted out.

CHAPTER V.

THE CHURCHES OF ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND UNDER THE UNION OF THE CROWNS.

JAMES VI. of Scotland succeeded Elizabeth on the throne of England on the 24th of March, 1603, and was crowned as James I. of England at Westminster on July 25th of that year. He abandoned the Presbyterian cause and threw himself entirely into the interest of the Episcopalian, thus disappointing both Puritans and Romanists. Stretching his royal authority beyond the bounds of previous example, he erected a court of high commission for Scotland, similar to that which had been constituted in England.

THE PURITAN CONTROVERSY UNDER JAMES I. AND CHARLES I. (1603-1640.)

The Anglican Church was still divided into the two parties of the prelatist and Puritan, the latter favoring more or less a Presbyterian form of church government, and the former the divine right of kings and the duty of implicit obedience on the part of their subjects. The prelatists accordingly enjoyed the full favor of King James, and to their principles all other parties were to be compelled to conform. His pur-

pose in respect to the Puritans was coarsely but plainly declared at a conference which he held at Hampton Court, January 14, 1604.

Although suffering much oppression, the Puritans withheld from disloyalty, the greater part of them remaining in the Established Church. Their cause was sustained by the new translation of the Bible—a work sanctioned by the king, but certainly not with a view to that end. A new impulse was given to biblical studies by the method in which the work of translation was conducted, being distributed in the hands of a great number of learned men at the principal seats of learning, while appeals were published to all the learned throughout the kingdom to aid in it by contributing any suggestions which occurred to them. The plan was proposed by Dr. Reynolds in the conference at Hampton Court in 1604, and the new translation was published by Robert Barker, London, in 1611. It was followed by a group of the greatest divines that the English Church had ever seen.

Hitherto, Puritans and prelatists had not differed much on essential doctrine, but the divergence was gradually increasing. With the reign of James, Arminianism, introduced from Holland, found most favor among the prelatists, while the Puritans adhered severely to Calvinism.

The tyranny of James, and especially his interference with religious freedom, alienated multitudes of his people; and when he died, in 1625, his dominions were in an agitated and dissatisfied condition.

Charles I. pursued the same policy, but with less caution. Laboring to crush nonconformity, he pro-

voked into open resistance both the Puritans, now a powerful party in the Anglican Church, and the people of Scotland. Under the advice of Laud, bishop of London, and from 1633 archbishop of Canterbury, the position of the prelatic party was carried back toward Romanism. The narrowest censorship was exercised over the press, and even over the private expression of opinion, with penalties painful and degrading. In the service of such a despotism the court of high commission became justly odious as an instrument of cruelty and injustice. With the royalist party the doctrine of divine right of kings and implicit obedience on the part of subjects reached the last degree of audacity. Dr. Roger Manwaring, in a sermon preached in 1628, defended the ground that "the king is not bound to observe the laws of the realm concerning the subjects' rights and liberties; but his royal word and command in imposing loans and taxes without consent of Parliament doth oblige the subjects' conscience, upon pain of eternal damnation." Charles was pleased with the sermon. It was printed. Parliament condemned it and ordered its author to prison, declaring him disabled from holding any office in Church or in State. When Parliament was dissolved, the king released him and promoted him to a benefice of great value. His Majesty also acted upon the principles set forth, and ruled without a Parliament eleven years.

CHURCH OF SCOTLAND UNDER JAMES I. AND CHARLES I.

In Scotland every means of crushing out the national Reformed Church and substituting prelacy designed

by James was carried forward by his successor. Presbyterians who accepted the king's parliamentary honors were appointed to episcopal sees, and an archbishop was once more in St. Andrews; but moderation was observed in respect to the insignia or badges of office and the forms of worship. Application to the king presenting the real sentiments of the Scottish people was made in vain. Charles followed only the advice of men of his own party. Meanwhile, a remarkable religious revival pervaded Scotland, and continued several years.

In 1633 the king visited his native country to obtain the crown and hold a Scottish Parliament. By those about him he was persuaded that all was now ready for carrying out completely the change in the ecclesiastical establishment. A book of canons was therefore drawn up according to the views of Laud and revised by him. With the royal sanction, it was printed in Aberdeen in 1635. Next year a liturgy was framed on the model of the English Prayer-Book and revised by Laud, and, without regard to the wishes of the people, a proclamation, issued in December, 1636, called upon all faithful subjects to conform to it. July 23, 1637, was appointed for beginning the new service in the new sacerdotal vestments by the new ecclesiastical dignitaries in full array. The attempt was met by a resistance so extensive and pronounced that the government shrank from further prosecution of the scheme for a time. Military force was lacking to the king, and the terms on which he stood with his English subjects were such that the means for suppressing resistance in Scotland were not easily to be obtained. He sent a

commissioner to take such measures as might be necessary to allay the excitement.

Meanwhile, the people of Scotland virtually governed themselves, and leaders were found prepared for the exigency. Alexander Henderson, a minister, and Johnston of Warriston, an eminent lawyer, and others, organized committees for conducting the public business with regularity. As a bond of national union, civil and religious, they drew up a covenant consisting of the acts of Parliament ratifying the constitution of the Reformed Church of Scotland and binding the signers to its maintenance and defence. It was first read and signed in a vast assembly in and around the Greyfriars church, Edinburgh, February 28, 1638, and afterward over the country, North and South. It was hailed with joyful welcome wherever it appeared, though not by all persons. Those who had submitted to the royal plan of government and of religion either disapproved of it or were indifferent. The smallness of their number is demonstrated by the consistent current of events. The covenant was national and recognized Christ as Head of the Church, but obligated also "to the defence of our dread sovereign the king's majesty, his person and authority, in the defence and preservation of the foresaid true religion, liberties and laws of the kingdom;" and maintained the lawful establishment of the national church.

A General Assembly met at Glasgow in November of that year; Alexander Henderson was moderator. The order of the Reformed Church of Scotland was restored, prelacy was abolished, and the Kirk Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods and General Assemblies were re-

stored to the full enjoyment of their constitutional privileges and powers.

Charles entered Scotland with an army. The Covenanters prepared to defend themselves. A treaty was signed in camp, in which the king promised that a free Assembly should be called forthwith and a Parliament convened to determine finally all the ecclesiastical and civil affairs of Scotland. The Assembly met. It renewed the covenant, which was signed by the king's commissioner, and confirmed the act of the Assembly of Glasgow in declaring prelacy unlawful in that Church. Parliament coincided with the Assembly, and the royal commissioner, dissatisfied, prorogued it and hastened to his master.

The king now determined to crush the Covenanters. An English Parliament was called to provide the means. Parliament insisted upon a redress of English grievances first. The king dismissed them and proceeded by means of loans and arbitrary exactions, with some voluntary contributions of friends, to raise and equip an army of twenty-one thousand men. Again he marched toward Scotland. The Covenanters met and defeated him at Newburn. Constrained by the difficulties he had himself evoked, the disaffection of his people and the necessities of his exchequer, and dreading to meet the representatives of the English people, he proposed a convention of the nobles to vote him supplies. But they, although ready, many of them, to contribute of their own means, could not put their hands to the public revenue. Reduced to the last necessity, he called another English Parliament, which met on the 3d of November, 1640.

CHAPTER VI.

REFORMATION IN IRELAND.

(1533-1642.)

WHEN Henry VIII. broke off his relations with Rome, he had to establish his supremacy not only in England, already largely anti-papal, but also in strongly-papal Ireland. The means employed were not well calculated to convert errorists, or to conciliate goodwill. They commenced by the consecration of an anti-papal archbishop of Dublin in March, 1535, and a demand that the royal supremacy should be acknowledged by the authorities, civil and ecclesiastical. It was vigorously resisted by the Romanists, and the archbishop of Armagh, primate of Ireland, was leader of the opposition. In a Parliament called next year the royalist party proved strong enough to secure a vote, and declared all who maintained the papal supremacy guilty of high treason. Some of the religious houses were immediately "dissolved and their revenues vested in the crown." Counter-instructions were received from Rome, and disobedience of the royal command was instigated from the highest quarter.

The cause of reformation in Ireland was seriously prejudiced from the beginning by interference of government, and made little progress except by immigra-

tion from England. In the reign of Elizabeth the Anglican Church was set up as the Establishment of Ireland, but continued to be an exotic. The island was conquered, but was very far from being reduced to order. Most of it lay in a lamentable state of poverty, desolation and barbarism. The English settlements on the eastern coast were continually harassed by attacks from the natives. In the province of Ulster the disorder and desolation reached the greatest extreme. There Shan O'Neil, in the reign of Elizabeth, aimed at establishing himself as king of Ireland by plundering and laying waste the territory of neighboring chiefs. His career was stopped by assassination. Early in the reign of James a conspiracy to expel the English was formed, chiefly by the northern nobles, who applied to France and Spain for aid. It was discovered before the time appointed for its execution, and its leaders, the earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnel, fled and left their vast estates at the mercy of the king. A second attempt resulted in a similar way. The death of its chief, O'Dogherty, threw his estates into the hands of the government. O'Neil, the largest landowner in the counties of Down and Antrim, saved about one-third of his estates by yielding the rest to persons who interceded for him with the king.

James resolved to settle his waste-lands in Ulster with loyal men from England and Scotland. Colonization commenced in the year 1610, and progressed rapidly. English Episcopalians and nonconformists and Scottish Presbyterians lived together harmoniously under the same church regulations, drawn up for them by Archbishop Usher, which presented also

a liberal side to Roman Catholics. That state of tranquillity continued until the commencement of interference by Archbishop Laud. Charles I., having obtained a large amount of money from Ireland on the promise of certain favors called "Graces" to both Catholics and Protestants, failed to keep his promise. To quell the discontent thereby created he sent Sir Thomas Wentworth as his deputy, who arrived in 1633. Wentworth with much ability and unrelenting severity carried out the purposes of his master, exalting "the royal prerogative on the ruin of the rights and liberties of the people," and was rewarded with a place among the peerage as earl of Strafford. The state of the Irish Church was also commended to his special care by Laud, archbishop of Canterbury, whose purpose was to force Ireland as well as England and Scotland into one ecclesiastical form consistent with the views of the king. Of the spiritual despotism then instituted Strafford made himself the efficient agent. His administration repressed resistance during its own time, but sowed the seeds of a terrible retribution.

When Charles I., having aroused the spirit of his Scottish subjects, was constrained to convoke an English Parliament, the state of Ireland was found to call for immediate attention. Strafford was then in England, having brought over reinforcements for the royal army which was fighting the Covenanters. He would have returned to his viceroyalty, but the king needed his counsel and retained him. Parliament took up his case immediately after securing the permanency of its own existence. He was impeached by the Commons before

the House of Lords, and after trial on charge of high treason was attainted and sentenced to death. He was beheaded May 12, 1641. His deputy in office died soon after, and the government of Ireland was put into the hands of two lords justices under authority of Parliament. Efforts were made to redress the grievances of all parties. But the Catholic Irish, brooding over wrongs of earlier times, and exasperated by late acts of regal perfidy and administrative injustice, had already plotted a rebellion, which failed in Dublin, but took effect, with indescribable scenes of slaughter, in the province of Ulster. It broke out in October, 1641, and in less than six months the Protestant churches of that part of the kingdom were completely extinguished.

In the course of the next summer (1642) the forces of rebellion in Ireland were defeated by an army brought from Scotland. The soldiers of that army, being Presbyterians, were constituted a Church in accordance with their own wishes, the elders being elected and ordained from their officers. After that example, when the Presbyterian ministers began to return from Scotland, to which they had fled, and the Scottish settlers came once more to occupy their homes, their churches were organized, not on the plan of compromise with Episcopacy, but as purely Presbyterian.

From that date events occurred which for several years united the cause of the churches in Ireland with those of England and Scotland, interesting all alike in certain great political and military movements and rendering one narrative in the main common to all three.

CHAPTER VII.

THE LONG PARLIAMENT.—PURITAN RULE.

THE new Parliament which Charles I. under constraint of irresistible necessity had called met at Westminster on the 3d of November, 1640. Other Parliaments in the course of that reign had been convoked, and, failing to comply with the king's demands, had been summarily dismissed; that which now met resolved to continue its sessions until redress of national grievances should be secured. On the same day on which the act of attainder was passed against Strafford "the king gave his assent to a law whereby he bound himself not to adjourn, prorogue or dissolve the existing Parliament without its own consent."

Matters of Church and State were so intimately united, and usurpations upon both so numerous and flagrant, that one of the earliest acts of the Long Parliament was necessarily to appoint a committee of religion. The odious Star-Chamber and the court of high commission were abolished, and the principal advisers of the king were impeached on charge of treason. Finch, the lord-keeper, and Windebank, the secretary of state, fled to the Continent; Strafford was tried and executed; Laud, the primate, was consigned to prison. His trial, July, 1644, was succeeded by

attainder in November of that year, and his execution in January following.

In February, 1642, the spiritual lords were excluded from their place in Parliament and from secular offices. The lords temporal continued to co-operate with the Commons.

The king, becoming impressed with a conviction that Parliament intended to hedge him around with restrictions, thought it prudent to come to peace with his Scottish subjects. During the recess of Parliament, in the autumn of 1641, he visited Scotland and consented to give up his plans for the Church in that country.

Petitions were presented to Parliament by the people and clergy of London, and by the Puritan clergy in general, praying for removal of the grievances of the Church. In September, 1642, an act was passed whereby, after the 5th of November next year, the Episcopal Church ceased to be the Established Church of England.

THE ASSEMBLY AT WESTMINSTER.

In view of this change in the Church Establishment an assembly of one hundred and twenty-one of the most learned divines of the kingdom, with thirty lay assessors—being ten lords and twenty commoners—was called to meet at Westminster to advise with Parliament on matters concerning the Church. The Assembly met on the 1st of July, 1643, and continued in full operation until February, 1649—a period of five years, six months, and twenty-two days, and comprehending eleven hundred and sixty-

three sessions. A few of the members held together as a committee for examination, ordination and induction of ministers until March 25, 1652, when, Parliament being dismissed, the remnant of the assembly also dispersed without any formal act of dissolution.

In that assembly there were men of Presbyterian views, prelatists, Independents and a few Erastians. Presbyterianism was soon found to be the doctrine of the majority, increased by four clerical commissioners from the Church of Scotland and nine laymen, only three or four of whom, however, attended. The Episcopal divines withdrew before the bringing in of the covenant from Scotland, and at the end of four years the Independents and Erastians, who were still fewer and differed from the majority on Church government, also withdrew. Presbyterianism prevailed also in Parliament, but found a weightier opposition from the Independents, who were subsequently strengthened by the overmastering Independent element of the Parliamentary army.

The Scottish General Assembly, which met on the 2d of August, 1643, was attended by commissioners sent from the English Parliament, some of whom were civilians, to transact business with the Scottish convention, and some ministers to confer with the assembly. One result of these conferences was the celebrated bond of union between the two countries called "The Solemn League and Covenant." Sanctioned by the Assembly in Scotland, August 17, it was carried to London, and on the 25th of September signed by the English Assembly and Parliament. Next year (1644) it was signed by the Protestants of Ireland.

The first work of the Westminster Assembly was the revisal of the Thirty-nine Articles; but after advancing as far as the fifteenth, that was abandoned and an entirely new confession undertaken. For that purpose a committee was appointed in May, 1645, who presented the work complete in November, 1646. After being thoroughly discussed and amended by the Assembly, this "Westminster Confession" received their sanction in May, 1647. It was then carefully revised, article by article, by the Houses of Lords and Commons, and published in June, 1648. A Directory for Worship was also prepared, and a Form of Church Government, and for purposes of instruction two Catechisms, a larger and a shorter, the former intended as the basis of doctrinal exposition from the pulpit, and the latter as a popular manual. The Shorter Catechism was presented to Parliament in November, 1647, and the Larger in April following.

These works were put forth simply as "the humble advice of the Assembly of Divines, by authority of Parliament sitting at Westminster." As such they were offered to all who might freely accept them. No ecclesiastical authority pretended to impose them on the world, and no anathemas were pronounced against those who might reject them. But they were soon accepted, in whole or in part, by such ecclesiastical bodies as conferred upon them the greatest weight.

A metrical version of the Psalms was also approved by the same venerable body. It was prepared by Francis Rous, a member of the Long Parliament,

and also a lay-member of the Assembly. Proposed by the House of Commons to the consideration of the divines, November 20, 1643, it was by them, after much discussion and many amendments, returned to Parliament, November 14, 1645, with the opinion that it might be "useful and profitable to the Church" "if permitted to be publicly sung." It was accordingly authorized by a vote of both Houses.

The General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, which met at Edinburgh on August 4, 1647, accepted the Westminster Confession as the doctrinal symbol of the Church which it represented, and took into consideration the metrical "paraphrase" of the Psalms "brought from England." For the latter purpose a committee was appointed to examine the new version and compare it with those of Zachary Boyd, Sir William Mure of Rowallan, and others. It was finally "authorized for Scotland by the General Assembly and the commission of estates in the beginning of the year 1650."

The Scottish Assembly of 1647 also approved the Directory for Public Worship and the Form of Church Government, which had been framed, indeed, upon the model of their own. The Catechisms were adopted next year (1648).

The works of the Westminster Assembly were also accepted by the Presbyterians in Ireland, and, with the exception of the Form of Church Government, by the colonists in New England at the Synod of Cambridge, 1648. In England the Confessions and Catechisms became the doctrinal standards of the Puritans, Congregationalists and Baptists as well as of the Presbyterians.

Meanwhile, the religious union of the majority of his people was working the overthrow of the despotic king. Encouraged by the high prelatists, the passive-submission party, and some of the nobility, Charles maintained for a time an angry controversy with Parliament, and, as he could not dissolve it, attempted to defeat its action by invasion of its privileges. The sheriffs of London, with the train-bands, prepared to protect the Parliament, whereupon the king withdrew from the city. Both parties began to collect military stores and raise forces. In the war which ensued the king was defeated, and after prolonged negotiations between him and the Parliament with the army he was finally brought to trial on the charge of being "a tyrant, a traitor, murderer and enemy of his country," and sentenced to death. His execution followed on the 30th of January, 1649.

THE CHURCHES UNDER THE COMMONWEALTH.

In the progress of the conflict the Independents had increased in numbers and power chiefly through their predominance in the army, but their control of Parliament was secured by violence. After the king's death they ruled the country through the remnant of the House of Commons and under the name of a commonwealth. The House of Lords was abolished. Cromwell, at the head of the army, put down all opposition in Ireland and Scotland, as well as in England. Presbyterians were monarchists. They had wished to restore the king with limitations of his power, and now looked to his son as their lawful monarch. In Scotland, Charles II. was openly recognized and crowned,

but, defeated by Cromwell in the decisive battles of Dunbar and Worcester, he fled to the Continent.

In the course of three years the government became involved in great embarrassment; the finances were deranged and the pay of the soldiers fell far in arrears. No sign appeared of remedy from Parliament, and it was dismissed by Cromwell. Another was called, but effected nothing. Cromwell was appointed to supreme authority, under the name of "Protector," by a council of officers with the lord mayor and aldermen of London and some other public functionaries—an act afterward legally confirmed by the Parliament of 1656. Under the Commonwealth all parties were permitted to practice their religion peacefully on condition of giving their assent to the Engagement, an instrument obligating loyalty to the existing authorities.

The Presbyterian Church had been established in England by act of Parliament, and, although actually set up in only a few places, was during the Commonwealth the model contemplated in all measures of the general government. Purity of doctrine and life, especially on the part of its ministers, was insisted on, but otherwise great freedom was enjoyed. Cromwell allowed no persecution for religion's sake; his liberal toleration was one of the bitterest charges against him in his own time. Not the less did he take measures to give efficiency to the Established Church and to purify it from incompetent or otherwise improper ministers.

The first step to that end was taken on the 20th of March, 1654, in the appointment of a commission for the trial of public preachers. It consisted of nine

laymen and twenty-nine clergymen, selected from the Presbyterians, Independents and Baptists with special view to their prudence, sagacity and sound Christian experience. By those "triers," as they were called, "any person pretending to hold a church living or levy tithes or clergy-dues in England" was first to be tried and approved as to his religious knowledge, moral character and ability to teach.

A second step, taken in the following August, consisted in appointing local commissioners, of both clergy and laymen, from fifteen to thirty in each county in England, whose duty it was "to inquire into scandalous, ignorant, insufficient and otherwise deleterious ministers of the gospel, and to be a tribunal for judging and ejecting them. Persons thus ejected, if married, were to be allowed a small pension."

Still further to distribute the force of government over the country and secure the regular working of minor appointments in both Church and State, the Protector in 1655 divided England into ten districts, placing in each, with the title of "major-general," a man most carefully chosen, of wisdom, fearing God and of unimpeachable integrity. These officers were invested with a universal superintendence, civil, military and ecclesiastical. They were to take care that the taxes were collected, to inquire after the private assemblies of suspected persons and such as frequented taverns and gaming-houses and after scandalous and unlearned ministers and schoolmasters, and to aid the commission in ejecting them. They were ordered to enlist a body of reserves at half pay who might be called together upon any sudden emergency. There

was no appeal from the major-general except to the Protector himself. This part of the government was only temporary, and when not sustained by Parliament was withdrawn. The commission of triers continued to sit at Whitehall until after the Protector's death. In 1659 it was discontinued.

In Scotland there was almost perfect agreement in sustaining the National Presbyterian Church, and little difference on the subject of loyalty to the absent Charles II. Submission to the existing rule was deemed the necessity of an interim. But what at one time had been a bond of union to Scotsmen now proved to be a cause of dissension. The National Covenant was turned into a religious test and subscription made indispensable to the holding of any place in the service of the country. During the war with Cromwell, Parliament passed certain resolutions repealing that law ; against those resolutions the stricter party protested. The quarrel between Resolutioners and Protestors marred the peace of the Church and involved it in civil broils. The General Assembly which met in July, 1652, was so agitated by these causes that it broke up, and its acts were never recorded. It did not meet again during the Protectorate. But Synods and Presbyteries continued to meet as formerly.

As in England, so in Scotland, means were taken by Cromwell to promote the interests of true religion. Mr. Patrick Gillespie and some others of the stricter party received a commission empowering them to settle the affairs of the Church and secure its purity. A quiet but persuasive revival of religion filled up the rest of the period of the Protectorate in Scotland.

Soon after the death of the king a commission was appointed to set in order the churches of Wales. The spiritual destitution of the principality was great. And, as it was difficult to find a sufficient number of pious and learned ministers able to preach in the Welsh language, itinerant preachers, six for each county, were appointed to supply the deficiency until the number equal to the parishes could be filled up.

Ireland was virtually divided by geographical limits among the great religious parties, the Presbyterians being chiefly residents of Ulster, the Episcopalians of Leinster, and the Roman Catholics of all the rest. Episcopacy had been the established religion from the Reformation; it ceased to be such under the action of the Long Parliament, in January, 1643. The terrors of the Catholic rebellion constrained Protestants of every name to make common cause. Cromwell with terrific severity compelled the Catholics to submission, confined them to one part of the island and filled the land taken from them with a more orderly and industrious population. In the prosperity which succeeded the Church participated. Under the lieutenancy of Major-General Fleetwood, and still more of Henry Cromwell, the long-harassed country enjoyed an interval of peaceful government.

In New England the colonists were allowed to establish Congregationalism as the religious system of their choice. A scheme was also projected for carrying the gospel to the North American Indians, which the death of the Protector prevented from going into operation.

It was the purpose of Cromwell to constitute the

British Church the centre of a confederation of all the Protestant churches of Europe. His plan, according to Bishop Burnet, was matured, and contemplated common defence against Rome, propagation of the gospel and the employment of secretaries to "hold correspondence everywhere, to acquaint themselves with the state of religion all over the world, that so all good designs for the welfare of the whole and of the several parts might by their means be protected and encouraged." Though this also was defeated by his death, his administration put the British isles into a leading relation to the Protestant world, which they did not again assume until the reign of William III. In this as in many other respects the Revolution was the true successor of the Commonwealth, less earnest and daring, but more cautious, expedient and successful.

Cromwell died on the anniversary of his great victories of Dunbar and of Worcester, September 3, 1658. His son Richard was put up as his successor—a man without either capacity or ambition to rule, and who was soon set aside. King Charles was invited to return, and in May, 1660, took possession of his father's throne.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE BRITISH CHURCHES IN THE RESTORATION.—PRELATIC RULE.

(1660-1688.)

ENGLAND.

PRESBYTERIANS, now in possession of power, expected to retain their place in the restored Establishment under the king, and were prepared to yield something to their Episcopalian partners in order to secure that end. A moderate Episcopacy on Usher's plan would have suited the views of most of them.

In this respect the English Presbyterians differed from those of Scotland. The latter had by their history been taught to regard Episcopacy as an enemy and consistently opposed and repelled its approaches in every shape; the former, having grown up side by side with it in the same Establishment, would have been content to remain there had its claims and exactions been moderated to tolerate them. Conferences were held between leading Presbyterians and the bishops with a view to that end, but nothing satisfactory came of them.

Meanwhile, a new Parliament had met. It soon evinced a spirit of bitter hostility to everything Puri-

tan. In addition to the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, another was now enacted, to be taken by all persons in all places of magistracy in the kingdom. By that oath the candidate abjured the Solemn League and Covenant, declared that he believed it unlawful, upon any pretence; to take up arms against the king, and was laid under obligation to take the sacrament of the Lord's Supper according to the Episcopal rite within one year after his election. Commissioners were appointed to visit the several corporations of England and turn out all who were found in the least degree distasteful to the government.

The Prayer-Book was enforced as the only form of worship tolerated in England. Each minister was required to sign a declaration that he truly believed and approved all that was contained in it. Episcopal ordination was made indispensable to any place in the ministry of the English Church. This act of uniformity went into operation on St. Bartholomew's day, August 24, 1662, when not less than two thousand ministers chose to quit their livings rather than subscribe to its conditions; and these were additional to those extruded before the act was passed.

The restored king, Charles II., was a man of no religion, of no earnest moral purpose; the profligacy of his life was a free, unscrupulous abandonment. Public offices were, in general, filled with men of his own stamp, whose supreme law was the royal will and who shrank from no injustice to give it effect, without troubling him about details. Especially were persons who lived godly lives exposed to suffering

and contempt. The example of a profligate court was followed with abundant docility by the fashionable public. Literature became a pander to depravity, and theology suffered from the contact. The rich and profound treatises of the preceding generation gave place in course of time to the teachings of a shallower school.

To the Presbyterians of England the changes made at the Restoration and the subsequent progress of events were most disastrous. Turned out of the Established Church, they could not maintain the organization proper to themselves, and were thereby broken into separate congregations. Under the common name of "nonconformists" they suffered great oppression until relieved in some degree by the Revolution. Their strength and discipline they never recovered. In course of time, from lack of common government, their churches fell into error and lost their orthodox faith. But they added largely to the elements of piety and zeal which in the course of the eighteenth century supplied the hosts of the great revival.

CHURCH OF SCOTLAND UNDER THE RESTORATION.

In England, Episcopacy had a strong hold upon a large body of the people, including a wealthy aristocratic class and the men who chiefly controlled the revenues of the Church, as well as in the prescriptive position of a former occupancy. In Scotland, however, the case was very different. There Episcopacy never had obtained a place in the hearts of the people. And yet in that kingdom the royal government now resolved to

enforce it. At first there was not even a plea for intrusion save the advantage which was contemplated in constraining all the people of the British isles into one form of religion. An agent for the purpose was found in James Sharp, a Presbyterian minister sent from Scotland to London in the interest of the Scottish Church. Together with three others, he there received episcopal consecration, and returned to plant Anglicanism in Scotland. Parliament met May 8, 1662, and invited the new bishops to take their seats. An act was passed rescinding all acts passed by and since the Assembly of Glasgow (1638), with the view of putting the state of ecclesiastical affairs back to what it was under the tyranny of Charles I. before the Covenant. Bishops were arbitrarily set over the kingdom, and archbishops in St. Andrews and Glasgow, with Sharp, archbishop of St. Andrews, as the primate. The ministers of the parishes who submitted to the intrusive system might retain their places under a new title, but those who declined to conform were ousted and their places filled with more compliant subjects. The parishioners, in general, preferred to follow their pastors. Government found that, having imposed a new clergy upon the people, they had also to compel the people to attend their ministrations, and means were adopted to that end.

The new privy council sustained the prelates in all their measures. Fines were imposed upon all persons who did not attend the church of their own parish or who attended the preaching of the ejected ministers anywhere. And, inasmuch as multitudes preferred to

pay the fines and enjoy such preaching as was felt to be profitable, the fines were increased and military were sent to exact them. These acts were followed by another to enforce the signing of a declaration condemning the Covenant, without which no person was to be eligible to any place of trust.

In 1664 the court of high commission was restored and endowed by the king with most extensive authority. It was empowered to punish all deposed ministers who presumed to preach, all attenders of conventicles and all who wrote, spoke, preached or printed against prelacy, and in general to do and execute what they should find necessary and convenient for His Majesty's service in the premises. In that court thenceforward resided the chief authority of persecution. Archbishop Sharp was the head of it. A real inquisition, it obtained intelligence of every sincere and consistent Presbyterian throughout the land, oppressed at will and passed sentence, if deemed expedient, upon mere accusation, without trial, or even hearing, of the accused.

A quarter of a century of awful suffering wasted the most worthy population of Scotland—that very class of the people which, if ruled with a moderate degree of wisdom, would have been the most profitable to the national wealth. Some were ruined by fines, some were imprisoned, some banished, some were driven into exile, some were sent into the colonies and sold for slaves, and many were put to torture and ignominious deaths. And all that to compel a people to accept their religion from the civil government!

Under this cruel and prolonged oppression the people refrained from rebellion, and only in one instance were any of them provoked into a fatal act of violence, and that in the assassination of Archbishop Sharp. The rising of Pentland was only an assemblage of countrymen for their common protection against the bands of soldiers who were plundering the country, and that which commenced at Drumclog was a worshipping congregation driven to self-defence by an attack of the military. The persecution, as it went on, became more reckless of even the forms of law, and finally troops of cavalry, under such leaders as Bruce of Earls hall and John Graham of Claverhouse, traversed the country plundering and murdering men and women whom they suspected of the proscribed faith wherever they met them. The death of Charles II., in 1685, wrought no relief for the Covenanters of Scotland. The indulgences of his successor were not for them. Some of the most notorious acts of atrocity were perpetrated in the reign of James II.

The cries of nonconforming England and of covenanting Scotland, raised day and night to Heaven, seemed long to have been raised in vain. James II. took a step which brought down the retribution upon himself and his dynasty, and with it the relief of his people. The Protestant heir to the crown was invited to England. James fled to France, and before they were fully aware the prelates had helped to seat a Presbyterian, in the prince of Orange, on the throne.

Some of the bishops in England, and all of them in Scotland, when they perceived the result, were confounded and indignant, and refused to acknowledge

the new king. But it was too late for regret. The last of the Stuart kings had gone, never to return. The last victim of their murderous oppression in Scotland was executed on the 17th of February, 1688. The revolution was secured, and the seemingly hopeless struggle of the Covenanters was victorious at last. They were restored to their place as the Established Church of Scotland.

CHAPTER IX.

CHURCHES IN THE BRITISH ISLES DURING THE REVOLUTION.

IN ENGLAND.

JAMES II. was an earnest Roman Catholic, in which faith his brother Charles also died. The chief object of his reign was to reinstate his coreligionists in power. In 1687 he issued in rapid succession three indulgences, ostensibly for all dissenters, but specifically removing all laws against Roman Catholics and making them eligible to all offices of trust and honor in the land. The Anglican prelates did not fail to see the purpose of the king's policy. On the 4th of May, 1688, an order of council was issued, commanding the ministers of the Established Church to read from their pulpits a declaration of liberty of conscience, which had been published a few days before. Some of them refused to comply, on the ground that the declaration was illegal. Seven bishops, one of them the primate, presented a petition to the king containing their reasons for what they had done. The king sent them to the Tower of London, and thereby aroused the whole episcopal body to an excitement under which they rushed into revolt against their own doctrine of passive obedience.

In June the seven bishops were brought to trial on charge of publishing a "seditious, false and malicious libel." Great was the excitement among the people; and when the bishops were acquitted, the king was virtually defeated on the ground of his whole policy. Proposals were sent to the prince of Orange, inviting him to come over and put himself at the head of a nation impatient to welcome him. William arrived on the 5th of November, and on the night of the 22d of December James stole secretly away.

William was a grandson of Charles I. His wife, Mary, was the eldest daughter of James II. But the source of his power lay in the choice of the people whom he ruled, and in his own prudence and liberality in recognizing constitutional limitations of kingly power.

IN SCOTLAND.

During the twenty-eight years which thus closed, according to the most competent authority, more than eighteen thousand persons had suffered for the Presbyterian cause in Scotland by imprisonment, exile, slavery and death, besides the desolation spread over the country by fines, assessments and lawless plunder of soldiery, by which whole districts were almost turned into a wilderness.

Toward the end of 1688 it was rumored that the deposed king was raising the Roman Catholic Irish for invasion of Scotland. The privy council accordingly issued a proclamation requiring all Protestant subjects to arm and put themselves in a state of defence. After that act of December 24, 1688, the Scottish privy council, so long the engine of persecu-

tion, came to an end by natural dissolution. The rumor of invasion proved unfounded. But, being organized and left to themselves, the troops took occasion to remove some of the prelatie curates who had been forced upon them. It was much to their credit in the circumstances that they injured neither life nor personal property.

By authority of King William a convention freely representing all classes of Protestants in Scotland met in Edinburgh, March 14, 1689. The revolution was recognized, and William and Mary were proclaimed on the 11th of April. Parliament assembled June 5 and recognized the work of the convention, passed an act "abolishing prelacy, and all superiority of any office in the Church in this kingdom above presbyters."

Meanwhile, Graham of Claverhouse, recently made Viscount Dundee by King James, was marching with an army southward from the Central Highlands. He was encountered July 7, 1679, by General Mackay, at the pass of Killiecrankie, where he was slain. His troops were victorious in the fight, but subsequently were worsted by the Cameronian regiment and dispersed, and the insurrection he had raised brought to a sudden termination.

In the next year, 1690, various acts were passed by Parliament restoring the constitution of the Church on the foundation of the acts of 1592, and declaring that the Church government be "in the hands of and exercised by those Presbyterian ministers who were ousted since the 1st of January, 1661, and such ministers and elders only as they have admitted and received

or shall hereafter admit and receive." In accordance with these and other acts of similar import, the General Assembly resumed its meetings, October 16, 1690, which have not been interrupted since that day.

IN IRELAND.

Through the latter part of the civil wars, the Presbyterians of Ireland, like those of England and Scotland, defended the cause of the king against Parliament. When Cromwell was proclaimed Protector, they withdrew opposition to what was then to be regarded as the government of the country. After his death they took the part of the Restoration. By this time they had in Ulster about seventy settled ministers, with eighty congregations and a population of one hundred thousand. Prelacy was now imposed upon them. Two archbishops for Armagh and Dublin and ten bishops were consecrated in Dublin, January 27, 1661. Armagh, to which belongs the primacy, was conferred upon Dr. Bramhall, and in filling the bishoprics that of Down and Connor was assigned to Jeremy Taylor.

Meetings of Presbytery were now prohibited, and Bishop Taylor commenced the work of oppression by calling upon the Presbyterian ministers to submit to his rule, and, when they declined, by ejecting them from their churches, which most of them had built up with their own evangelical labors. Ministers thus ejected were forbidden, under heavy penalties, to preach, exhort or administer the sacraments anywhere. In the Irish Parliament, Presbyterians found few friends. The prelatic Establishment was sustained,

to the great hardship of both Catholic and Protestant dissenters. After the death of Bishop Taylor the severity was to some degree relaxed in Ulster, but the condition of the Presbyterian Church there remained very precarious, depending upon the temper of men in power. In 1684, under their deplorable oppression, most of the ministers of Derry and Donegal thought of removing to America. The death of the king, in February following, induced most of them to remain in hopes of better times. They were disappointed: James had his favors for dissenters, but only for Romish dissenters. In 1688 the Protestants received information that the Romanists intended to rise in arms and murder them. The inhabitants of Londonderry, Enniskillen and Coleraine shut themselves up within the walls of their respective cities. The open country was laid waste and its people were destroyed by the Romish party.

When James fled from England, he trusted that the Roman Catholic party in Ireland would be strong enough to sustain a reaction to restore him. He landed at Kinsale, March 12, 1689, to put himself at the head of the insurrection. His lieutenant, Tyrconnel, had already reduced all Ulster except Londonderry, which was strongly besieged. In August the duke Schomberg arrived and restored tranquillity to Ulster. And in June of the next year (1690) William landed and took command of his own army. The campaign and battle of the Boyne followed, which, although it did not end the war, decided its issue. James, defeated, returned to France, and the government of the new king, with its more liberal principles, was set up in

Ireland. Henceforward the working of the revised constitution of the English government gradually prevailed over that oppression in which the Establishment had indulged so long, though it did not soon bring it to an end.

PRINCIPLES ADOPTED AT THE REVOLUTION.

The English constitution was now revised and improved. On the subject of religion the policy of enforcing uniformity was abandoned. An Established Church was to be retained, but without compulsion to attend upon its worship. Prelacy was recognized as entitled to the ecclesiastical property of the nation in England and Ireland, and Presbytery in Scotland, but in both cases with toleration to dissenters.

Certain points of government which had long been in dispute were now reconsidered and definitely settled. The king's prerogatives were defined and limited, and his support was provided for by a regular salary. Constraint was put upon him to execute the duties of his office through responsible agents, and his authority was to be excluded from the arguments of Parliament. Entire control of the public revenue, both in raising and in expending it, was secured to the representatives of the Commons. Parliaments were made regular and triennial. The lords, temporal and spiritual, were to represent their own order in the common interest, but were excluded from all voice in imposing taxes or expending revenue. Judges were no longer to hold office under the royal will, but for life or good behavior, and censorship of the press was suffered to expire without renewal.

CHRONOLOGY FROM A. D. 1648 TO 1885.

German Emperors.	Popes.	Greek Catholic Church.	Czars of Russia.
1659 Leopold I.,	1655 Alexander VII.,	<p>Since the middle of the seventeenth century the importance of Constantinople has been greatly surpassed by the Church of Russia, which became a patriarchate in 1587 Job, first patriarch, 1607 Hermogenes, 1619 Philaret. 1633 Joseph I. 1642 Joseph. 1652 Nikon. 1667 Joseph II. 1673 Pitirim. 1674 Joachim. 1690 Adrian. End of patriarchate.</p>	1645 Alexis,
1705 Joseph I.,	1667 Clement IX.,		1676 Theodore II.,
1711 Charles VI.,	1670 Clement X.,		1682 Ivan V. and Peter,
1740 { Francis I. (in right of his wife), Maria Theresa.	1676 Innocent XI.,		1696 Peter, sole czar,
	1689 Alexander VIII.,		1725 Catharine I.,
1765 {	1691 Innocent XII.,		1727 Peter II.,
1780 Joseph II.,	1700 Clement XI.,		1730 Anne,
1790 Leopold II.,	1721 Innocent XIII.,		1740 Ivan,
1792 Francis II.,	1724 Benedict XIII.,		1741 Elizabeth,
1805 Imperial title of Ger-	1730 Clement XII.,		1761 Peter III.,
many surrendered. Francis assumes that of Austria as Francis I.	1740 Benedict XIV.,		1762 Catharine II.,
The imperial title inherited from Charlemagne transferred to France in 1804	1758 Clement XIII.,		1796 Paul,
1804 Napoleon I.,	1769 Clement XIV.,		1801 Alexander I.,
1814 Vacancy until 1852	1775 Pius VI.,		1823 Nicholas,
1852 Napoleon III.,	1800 Pius VII.,		1855 Alexander II.,
Imperial succession transferred to Prussia.	1823 Leo XII.,		1881 Alexander III.
1870 William.	1829 Pius VIII.,	<p>1792 Stephen Yavorsky, guardian, 1792</p> <p>1793 Establishment of the Holy Governing Synod, the present highest authority of the Church in Russia.</p>	
	1831 Gregory XVI.,		
	1846 Pius IX.,		
	1878 Leo XIII.		

CHAPTER X.

THE YEAR 1648 AS AN ECCLESIASTICAL EPOCH.

(1648-1790.)

THE middle of the seventeenth century presents one of those great junctures in history by which the progress of the Church is divided into periods of different characteristics. By the year 1648, Protestant nations had successfully asserted their independence, defined their ecclesiastical positions and adopted their authoritative symbols. Rome, in reactionary conflict, had abandoned the ground of ancient orthodoxy, her defence of semi-Pelagianism, in opposition to Jansen, having crowned the work of Trent. Oriental Christians of the Orthodox (Greek) Catholic Church, although greatly diminished in number and oppressed by Mohammedan rule—Russia alone sustaining the dignity of an independent patriarchate—also produced about the same time that Confession whereby their doctrinal standing was popularly declared.

Recent attempts made by Rome to bring the Eastern Church under her dominion had proved as fruitless as all preceding efforts of that kind. The gulf between the Greek and the Roman Catholic churches remained as constituted in the eleventh century.

The issue of the Thirty Years' war had demonstrated

that to hold Romanist and Protestant under one ecclesiastical jurisdiction was not practicable. More distinctly than ever had it been determined that the current of church history, so far as those parties were concerned, was to flow in separate channels. By the Peace of Westphalia the war in Germany between Protestants and Romanists was settled on the principle of a balance of power, the separate existence of Holland as a Protestant nation was recognized, and the Reformation in the Scandinavian kingdoms assumed as authoritative, Sweden being one of the high contracting parties. The papal protest was without effect.

The Treaty of Westphalia also determined fundamental political maxims for all Europe, to which even parties then apparently unconcerned in them, or reluctant against them, were in course of time constrained to conform. Against the old ambition of universal empire and of a universal bishop, systematic opposition was organized in an equal balance of European powers. No longer was either pope or emperor to be sustained in the strife for supremacy.

Not all at once could this treaty go into effect: where Jesuits were strong little regard was had for its conditions. In Bohemia, Silesia and Hungary the Protestant churches were subjected to many unjust restrictions.

In France the Edict of Nantes was still in force, but ill-complied with on the part of the government, then in the hands of Cardinal Mazarin as regent during the minority of Louis XIV. The Jansenist controversy was beginning to enlist attention beyond the bounds of France and the Netherlands, but the

principal doctrines brought thereby into discussion were already sufficiently defined. Elsewhere in Romish countries Jesuits were the ruling spirits, and had succeeded in reaching the last extremity of the anti-reform action.

In Holland and Geneva the Reformed churches had attained the full day of prosperity. In England the Puritans had defeated the king and were about to set up the Commonwealth in the interest of a progressive reformation. The Assembly of Divines at Westminster had completed its work, and the last lingering delegates remained only to execute in a few cases what had been already enacted. Their Confession, Catechisms, Form of Government and Directory for Public Worship had been accepted in Scotland, in the Presbyterian Church of Ireland and—in all but the Form of Government—in New England, and thereby the definitive statement of Reformed doctrines was settled for the English-speaking people outside of the Anglican Establishment.

A similar service had been at an earlier day executed for the Reformed churches on the Continent, and as a whole by the Synod of Dort, and by the Thirty-nine Articles for the Anglican Church. Lutheran doctrines remained as determined by its two great founders and as harmonized in the Form of Concord. In the Greek Church the orthodox Confession had received the sanction of the councils of Kieff and Jassy. And equally conclusive for the Romish Church had been the work of the Council of Trent and the Confession of Pius IV.

Alike in the Greek, Roman and Protestant connec-

tions, the middle of the seventeenth century, and especially the year 1648, formed a momentous epoch in the history of doctrine. All the most authoritative confessions were published by that time. The union of Church and State remained in force, but their relations were now different in different countries ; and although persecution was often exercised by the stronger party, yet the right of each nation to follow the Confession of its choice had been distinctly vindicated.

RESPECTIVE POSITIONS ASSUMED BY THE THREE
GREAT BRANCHES OF THE CHURCH.

The position taken by the Greek Catholic Church is that of strict conformity to the ancient, maintained by unvarying hereditary practice, without omission or alteration or addition of any essential particular, since the last true œcumenical council, in 879, when the bishops of both East and West met freely and on equal terms. The Greek presents itself as the unchanged orthodox Catholic Church of antiquity—the only true Church. Rome cannot deny that alterations have taken place within her communion, but claims, notwithstanding, to be the only true Church, out of which there is no salvation, and to have within herself an infallible guide to all truth, over and above the Scriptures, and a process of apostolical and spiritual development whereby all the changes she may introduce become as binding as revelation. The Nestorian and Monophysite churches, although deeply corrupted, adhere to their ancient characteristic doctrines—the Nestorian to the separation of the two natures in Christ, and the Monophysites to the one nature.

The Protestant churches hold that the only true Christian doctrine is to be found in the Holy Scriptures. They respect the practice of immediately post-apostolic Christians, the doctrinal decisions of classical councils and the writings of the classical Fathers, but accept them only in so far as they are found to be conformable to Scripture, which is their sole standard of faith.

All three—Greek, Roman and Protestant—within their own respective bounds, contain minor divisions and dissenting sects, but the Protestant alone, although not very consistently, recognizes that fact and accepts it as a legitimate condition of the Church. The other two deny the right of dissent, war against it and seek to extinguish it, and yet are constrained under various pleas and disguises to indulge or submit to it.

THE ORIENTAL CHURCHES.

Since the Council of Chalcedon (451), Oriental Christianity has been divided into three great branches, as Greek, or orthodox Catholic, and the so-called heretical Nestorian and Monophysite communions. The jurisdiction of these sections is not everywhere geographically distinct, but, in the main the orthodox occupies the eastern countries of Europe and the extreme West of Asia; the Monophysites, the next adjoining portions of Asia, together with Egypt and Ethiopia; and the Nestorians, the farther East. In Western Asia, however, and Egypt, they interramify with one another, having in many cases their churches side by side. Patriarchs of both orthodox and Monophysite persuasion in both countries exercise their

jurisdiction over the same district, but in relation to separate pastoral charges.

NESTORIANS.

Of the twenty-five metropolitan sees of which the Nestorian Church at one time consisted, with its missions in Central Asia, India and China, only fragments now remain. The most important is a population of about one hundred and fifty thousand, who live on the great plain of Oroomiah, in the North-west of Persia and among the adjoining mountains of Kurdistan. There are also communities of them in the South-west of India, where they have sometimes been called "Syrian" or "St. Thomas Christians." In both places missionaries, Roman Catholic and Protestant, have recently labored among them with some success, until they are now still further diminished and divided. In the sixteenth century the Romanists, by force of Portuguese arms, constrained a number of those who lived on the Malabar coast of India to submit to the pope and accept changes in their worship and government accordingly. Those who lived farther inland, under the protection of native princes, retained their ancient faith. In the beginning of the present century they were brought to the notice of the British public by the Rev. Claudius Buchanan, who visited them in 1806. A mission of the English Church was soon established at Travancore. Its object at first was simply to revive education and true scriptural knowledge among the clergy, and for many years it proceeded with encouraging success; but between 1832 and 1836 that method was abandoned, and by a de-

cision of the metropolitan bishop of the English Church in India all recognition of the Syrian Christians as a Church was withheld, and converts from them were to be received as members of the Church of England.

The remnant of that ancient people still residing on the borders of Persia and Turkey were visited in the seventeenth century by Romish missionaries, who succeeded in converting to papal allegiance the more southern portion of them, called "Chaldean Christians." The inhabitants of the mountains and of the plains of Oroomiah retained their Nestorian Creed and church order.

Little was known about them by Western Protestants until 1830, when they were visited by Messrs. Smith and Dwight, of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. A mission was in a few years planted on the plain of Oroomiah. It was not designed to attempt any change in the Nestorian order, form of worship or ancient creed, but to labor for a revival of true practical piety by the promotion of education, scriptural knowledge and evangelical influences, to purify and awaken the old Christian Church of that denomination. Subsequently, however, there has grown up among the Nestorians a new Church of Presbyterian character, according to the convictions of the missionaries laboring there.

MONOPHYSITES.

Of the Monophysites there are still three grand divisions, the heads of which are Egypt, Syria and Armenia, constituting a belt of nations extending

from the southern foot of the Caucasus to the southern border of Ethiopia. Nubia and Abyssinia acknowledge the supremacy of the Monophysite patriarch of Egypt, who makes his residence at Cairo.

The Copts, the descendants of the ancient Egyptian population, who profess Monophysite Christianity, are now reduced to about two hundred thousand. Their Church is very corrupt and long ago abandoned the duty of instruction. The people are ignorant, and yet are said to be of superior intelligence to the Fellahs, their countrymen, who have adopted Mohammedanism, and who number about two millions. The mission of the United Presbyterian Church of the United States has done much in reviving scriptural knowledge and piety among the Copts.

The second patriarchate of that connection is governed by the Monophysite patriarch of Antioch.

The third division is constituted by the peculiar views of the Armenians. Chief of their connection is a patriarch catholicus, whose residence is at Etchmiadzin. Two other patriarchs, of more limited jurisdiction, reside respectively at Cis, in Cilicia, and at Aghtamar, in Lake Van. They have also prelates—dignified by the title of “patriarch”—who protect the interests of their Church as concerned in its members scattered through the Catholic dioceses of Constantinople and Jerusalem, besides vicariates and archbishops in Persia and Russia.

In point of intelligence the Armenians are superior to others of their communion, nor is their Church so corrupt as the Monophysite elsewhere. Theologically, Monophysites differ from the Greek Catholic Church

in little save the dogma touching the oneness of the nature in Christ. But they have not adopted the practices introduced into the Catholic Church subsequently to the Second General Council of Constantinople (553). On the other hand, they retain some elements of Judaism, and in Egypt and Abyssinia observe circumcision.

As among the Nestorians, so among the Monophysites, there are converts to the Latin Church and organizations under Romish authority, the fruit of Romish missions. The Latin patriarchate of Antioch, commenced in the time of the crusades, is still continued, and constitutes the seat of authority in Aleppo. Jesuit missionaries, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, among the Abyssinians failed. More recently Protestant effort in that quarter has met with little more encouragement. Among the Armenians, Protestant missionaries from the United States have labored with much success. Some missionary work is also done among them by laborers from England and the continent of Europe.

MARONITES.

A remnant of the ancient Monothelite sect, under the name of "Maronites," maintained themselves in the profession of their faith among the mountains of Lebanon until the twelfth century. About 1182 they began to abandon Monothelitism and to submit to the jurisdiction of Rome. That predilection was confirmed at the Council of Florence, in 1445. But their subscription in 1736 to the decrees of the Council of Trent could not be more than formal, for they are tolerated and insist upon toleration in many of their an-

cient Oriental practices, and are allowed to retain their own patriarch and ecclesiastical order. A college at Rome, established on their behalf, has been distinguished by the Assemani and other illustrious ecclesiastical scholars, to whose writings we are chiefly indebted for information touching the Eastern churches. Their patriarch, who lives in the monastery of St. Mary, at Kanobin, not far from Tripoli, takes, in common with the orthodox Catholic, the Monophysite and Romish patriarchs, the title "of Antioch," but the people over whom his authority extends are to be found principally in Mount Lebanon and the cities of the neighborhood. He is elected by his own communion, but receives the pallium and confirmation in office from the pope. A small number of them still reject the connection with Rome and adhere to their ancient ecclesiastical independence.

Of all parts of Eastern Christendom, the most divided by the presence of conflicting parties are the sees of Antioch and Jerusalem.

CHAPTER XI.

THE GREEK CATHOLIC CHURCH.

IN the orthodox, or Greek Catholic, Church, although Constantinople still enjoys the honor of precedence, the most important diocese is that of Russia. In addition to these, there are the patriarchates of Alexandria, of Antioch and of Jerusalem, although only skeletons of their ancient substance, and the three metropolitans of Cyprus; of Austria and of Montenegro, together with the archbishop of Mount Sinai and the Church of independent Greece, which is governed by a synod.

The Greek Church admits the rank of the pope as patriarch, and his primacy in the West of Europe as holding the only episcopal see founded by apostles in that quarter, but condemns his assumption of headship and of universal authority as unwarranted. It also holds that he and Western Christendom in general have long been guilty of heresy and schism in corrupting the standards and separating from the communion of the only orthodox Catholic Church. The equal independence of all the patriarchs is constantly maintained, and the rank of œcumenical is not allowed to any except in that sense in which it is proper to all, although Constantinople is superior in honor. The number of orthodox patriarchates in the

seventeenth century was five, as determined by ancient councils, Russia having been admitted to the place left vacant by the schism of Rome.

Church government of the whole Greek Catholic connection is synodal. Its highest authority is the synod of patriarchs. The monarchial system of Rome is condemned as unscriptural, the power of the keys having been committed, not to Peter alone, but to all the apostles. While the union of Church and State is defended, each is held to be sovereign within its own sphere, the State being under duty to protect the Church, while the Church sustains the order and authority of the State. In Mohammedan countries these relations have long been in a condition of great derangement. They are most consistently observed in Russia and independent Greece, where the churches are governed by synods.

Each patriarch is elected by the church over which he is to preside—that is, by the synod of the diocese—and approved by the chief magistrate of the state. In Mohammedan countries the latter condition is subject to great abuse, not unfrequently involving simony and extreme oppression on the part of the civil ruler.

In the Greek Church unity consists in recognition of the same doctrines, of the canons of ancient councils, the common synodal authority and the same forms of worship and ceremonies. Since the defection of Rome synods have not been regarded as general, but as authoritative simply for the jurisdiction of the prelates assembled in them.

GREEK CHURCH IN RUSSIA.

In the middle of the seventeenth century Moham-
medanism prevailed in the countries which had be-
longed to the ancient jurisdiction of the Oriental
churches. Christians, now only a sprinkling where
once they constituted the mass of the population,
were barely tolerated under great oppression. A
more recent conquest yielded the Greek Church a
freedom and a power which it enjoyed nowhere else.
To that quarter its subsequent history chiefly belongs.
From Russia have proceeded all the progressive
movements of modern Greek Catholicism, and by
Russia have the rights of Greek Christians in gen-
eral been defended against both Mohammedan and
Romanist. Every step which has gone to put the
Greek Church into relations with the modern world
has issued from that quarter.

From the introduction of Christianity into Russia,
in 992, until 1587, the Church in that country was
governed by a metropolitan appointed from Constanti-
nople. At first the ecclesiastical capital was Kieff, but
after that city, in 1240, was captured by the Mongols,
the seat of authority was moved more than once,
until in 1328 it was planted at Moscow by the illus-
trious metropolitan St. Peter. Before the Mongol
invasion Russia, although a large country, was but an
unimportant power lying chiefly toward the south-west
of her present territory. By that invasion the greater
part of her people were reduced to bondage, and the
fragment of dominion which remained was limited to
the North. The long-continued wars whereby the

invaders were gradually expelled fortified Russian character, intensified its nationality, and, over-against the Mohammedanism of the Tartars, caused the profession of Christianity to become the badge of loyalty and the battle-cry of liberation. As the Moorish occupation of Spain made Spaniards the fiercest champions of Roman Catholicism, so the Tartar occupation of Russia was one important means whereby the great modern defenders of Greek Catholicism were educated for their work.

The Mongols were finally expelled in 1481, twenty-eight years after the Turks had taken Constantinople. The Russians, then independent, felt reluctant to accept their ecclesiastical chief from the subjects of an enemy of their religion. To avoid that, the method was adopted of having the metropolitan of Moscow appointed by a synod of bishops within his own province. This irregularity was brought to an end in 1587 by agreement of the other patriarchs to elevate the metropolitan of Moscow to the rank of patriarch on equal footing with themselves, and to constitute Russia a separate diocese of the Greek Catholic Church.

There are four great historical personages to whom modern Russia is especially indebted—namely, Philaret, Peter Mogilas, Nikon and the czar Peter. By those names are the principal stages in its history marked.

Russia at several periods has had to defend herself against the overbearing aggression of Romanism. Taking advantage of the death of the czar Theodore (1598), and the deranged state of the imperial succession which followed, Romish priests from the side of Poland as-

sociated themselves with insurrection, corrupted the dissatisfied and conspired with otherwise designing persons to bring about a union with Rome. Under the management especially of the Jesuit Possevin, that process was clandestinely introduced into the southwest. Supported by the arms of Poland, a pretender to the throne accepted the union and was carried to the Kremlin of Moscow by force. He was soon slain. But the Poles held their ground, added to their troops, took possession of Moscow and set up the Romish forms of worship in its holiest places. It was then that the monks of the *Troitza Lavra* ("monastery of the Trinity") made that illustrious defence of their stronghold and raised that voice of appeal to the patriotism of their countrymen whereby they rolled back the tide of invasion from their borders.

Theodore Romanoff, nearest heir to the throne on the termination of the lineal descent of Ruric, had been compelled by the usurper to go into a monastery, and was then a monk under the name of "Philaret." His son Michael was confined in another religious house. Upon the close of the fierce and bloody conflict, the priests, who had fairly earned a right to have their wishes consulted, affectionately turned their eyes to the son of their noble brother Philaret. The nobles could present no other candidate for the crown with so good a claim. Accordingly, Michael Romanoff commenced the new imperial dynasty on the basis of defence of the orthodox Catholic Church and opposition to Uniates¹ and Romanists. He ascended the throne in 1613. His father was liberated from captivity

¹ Uniates, Eastern Christians in communion with the see of Rome.

to become patriarch of Russia. That ecclesiastical dignity was thereby greatly enhanced, and the privileges of the office were extended to a degree not previously yielded in the Greek Church.

Long-protracted disorders continued to harass the south-western part of the country through Uniate plots and usurpation sustained by Romish authorities from Poland, which in those days incurred a debt of violence and aggression to be afterward terribly repaid.

Within the same period the wildernesses of Siberia were first occupied by Russian arms. The Church followed in the footsteps of conquest. In 1623, Philaret established the archbishopric of Tobolsk and Siberia as a means of organizing missionary effort and of reforming the morals of the Cossacks, who, although the pioneers of nominal Christianity, were as lawless as the heathen whom they subdued. Philaret died in 1631. In the following year Peter Mogilas, the most learned Russian ecclesiastic of his day, was elevated to the metropolitan see of Kieff. His efforts for education were commenced in his monastery, where he founded a school, and from which he persuaded several of his most promising scholars to go to foreign universities to complete their studies. He also obtained from the king of Poland, under whose dominion his province then lay, the "restoration of many convents, churches and properties which had been taken away from the orthodox, together with freedom to establish seminaries and schools and printing-presses," and other privileges for the Russian Church. His convent-school he enlarged into a college, annexing to it a preparatory school and erecting buildings for the accommodation

of poor students at his own expense. He also collected a library and set up a printing-press, from which he issued editions of the Greek Fathers and books of the service of the Church to counteract the active efforts of Romanists. His Office-Book became the model for performance of the orthodox service. If not the most important, at least the most celebrated, work of his life was the *Orthodox Confession*, written by himself or under his direction. A council of bishops was called in Kieff to revise it. After passing through their corrections it was translated into modern Greek and sent to Parthenius, patriarch of Constantinople. In 1643 a synod convoked at Jassy condemned the doctrines of Calvin, and at the instance of Parthenius revised and approved the orthodox Confession which was then sent to the other Oriental patriarchs, who gave it their confirmation and returned it, with letters of approval, to Kieff.

Peter Mogilas died in 1647. His work was performed, in the first instance, for the Greek Church of Little Russia, then under the rule of Poland, but in it he had also a view to the wider dominion of the czar, if not to the whole Oriental communion, to which an important part of it necessarily extended.

The whole Greek Catholic Church by its proper authorities formally accepted the Confession, but only in Russia was it productive of any vital action or did it lead to any further efforts for popular instruction.

In 1645 the czar Michael died and was succeeded on the throne by his son Alexis, whose reign commenced with reform of the laws. A commission was appointed, with prince Niketa Odoëfsky, the most

illustrious lawyer of Russia, at its head, to make a collection of the canons of the ancient Fathers and laws of the Greek emperors, to correct the statute-book of the czar John and to add thereto the ukases of later czars, and to systematize all into one code for the whole empire. By the end of the year the work was complete. As in the labors of Philaret the Church had intertwined her jurisdiction with that of the State, so in this revision of the laws the State extended her authority to embrace the Church. A more intimate connection was thereby established between the two than in any other diocese of the Oriental Catholic communion.

In the fourth year of his reign (1649), Alexis was first made acquainted with the merits of the monk Nikon, who had come to the capital to plead the wants of his fraternity. Such a man could not be allowed to return to seclusion. He was retained at Moscow and admitted to the councils and intimate friendship of his monarch, and for many years the policy of the nation was swayed by his advice. In 1653 he was raised to the place of patriarch, which he retained six years. Through the support of Alexis and his own transcendent abilities, Nikon in that brief term of office carried the Russian primacy to its highest pitch of authority and instituted reforms of long-persistent abuses which as reforms would have been better understood and of longer duration had not the jealousy and misrepresentation of enemies interposed. Means were secured of withdrawing from him the favor of the czar. Too hastily, in a fit of indignation, he resigned his office, and thereby stripped himself

of the power necessary to give his improvements effect. That one false step his enemies took care that he should never have the opportunity of retracing: to the end of his days he was confined in a monastery.

The most useful work which Nikon effected was the correction of the church-books, which in the long course of centuries when they were copied by hand had become corrupted by the ignorance and oversight of copyists. Many of those corruptions had been retained in the printed editions, and errors of the press had increased the evil and some had been introduced by heretical design. In the face of much opposition he proceeded with the correction of his new editions by the old Slavonic and Greek manuscripts. From various quarters collections were made of the most ancient manuscripts of the sacred books. One messenger sent to Mount Athos collected as many as five hundred Greek books, among which was a copy of the Gospels written ten hundred and fifty years before. The Eastern patriarchs added two hundred more similar manuscripts. Upon introducing his corrected books into the churches, he encountered opposition from the multitude, who took his restoration of the old for an introduction of that which was new.

Nikon also put restraint upon the evil practices of the clergy, especially the prevalent one of intemperance, and upon errors in church service, and went so far as to remove from sight all such pictures as he thought were objects of undue veneration. He did much to promote education, had Greek and Latin introduced into the schools, improved the style of church music and procured the means for publishing

the Slavonic translation of the Bible in its purity. He was also the first to break through and take steps to do away with the Oriental seclusion of women which had hitherto prevailed. He also revived by precept and in his own ministrations the practice of preaching, which had in the Greek Church been utterly neglected for centuries. During his administration large addition was made to the jurisdiction of the Russian patriarchate by annexation of the Cossacks of the Ukraine. Steps were taken by him also toward the transfer of the metropolitan see of Kieff from the connection with Constantinople to that of Moscow, which was effected, though not in his day.

The deposition of Nikon occurred in 1667; his death, in 1681. His successors in the primacy originated nothing of importance. Upon the death of the czar Theodore, next year, the country was plunged into a state of disorder and agitation. The young prince Peter, a boy of ten years of age, was proclaimed in preference to John, his elder brother, on the ground that the latter was incapacitated by imbecility. Peter continued to pursue his studies with uncommon zeal and success under direction of the patriarch Joachim, by whose aid he also defeated the ambition of his sister Sophia and the mutinous *streltzi*, or imperial guards. When he was still only eighteen years of age, his friend and guardian, Joachim, died. Peter, thus early thrown upon his own judgment, began his reign by making himself acquainted with the resources and wants of his country, fully purposed to develop the one and

supply the other by every means which he possessed or could command, whether at home or abroad. His reforms were more thorough than those of Nikon, and sustained by a weight of authority which the enterprising ecclesiastic never possessed. The patriarch Adrian was old and feeble, but the czar found cordial support from other eminent churchmen, especially from Stephen Yavorsky, preacher in Kieff.

After the capture of Azoff had given weight to his reputation, and the death of his brother John, in 1696, had left him sole czar, Peter determined to enlarge his intellectual stores by foreign travel. In the suite of an embassy, in which his preceptor appeared as the principal, he visited Holland, France, England and Germany, studying carefully the elements of their culture and prosperity. From Vienna he was called home by another mutiny of the *streltzi*; his career of reform opened in the effective punishment of that refractory militia. He proceeded to carry out his purpose to bring the manners and customs, government and life of Russia as near as possible into conformity with those of the West of Europe. That sweeping reform which stooped to prescribe the cut of their dress for his people could not overlook the state of the Church. Many things were held too sacred to be touched, but others at variance with ancient practice or Greek principle could be altered or removed without serious opposition; some which had crept in from the Western Church were the most obnoxious, and could be the most easily attacked.

When Peter came to the throne, he found that, absolute as was his power in theory, it was actually

divided with the clergy. By the steps of a process already indicated the patriarchate had almost forsaken its Byzantine ground and approximated to the papal. Nothing stood more in the way of the imperial reformer. Upon the death of Adrian, who protested against every innovation to the last, when the bishops assembled to elect a successor, the czar appeared among them and advised that such action was not necessary at that time. Stephen Yavorsky was appointed guardian of the Church, with provisional oversight of its affairs. The patriarchal court was closed and all its business except purely ecclesiastical matters transferred to the civil courts; these last were subjected to a monastery court, now constituted with powers defined expressly for that purpose. At the same time all attempts to interfere with the orthodox doctrine or established practice of the Church were severely repressed, whether made from the Roman or the Protestant side.

For twenty years the supreme government of the Church was held in suspense, until a generation had grown up without allegiance to an ecclesiastical sovereign. At the end of that time the czar suggested that only a synodal administration was capable of answering the wants of the Church. He did not immediately press that view, but it was consistent with the plan of supreme government in the Greek Church. Finally, it was submitted to a council called in St. Petersburg in the beginning of the year 1721, and, after discussion, accepted. The new constitution was approved by the highest in the land, both lay and ecclesiastical. Subsequently it received the sanction of

the patriarchs of the East, as communicated in a letter from Constantinople dated September 23, 1723. Ever since, the Church of Russia has been presided over by the Holy Governing Synod, which occupies the place of a patriarch.

Russian clergy are of two classes, distinguished by the names "white" and "black," the former being the secular or parish priests, and the latter the regulars or monks, from whom the metropolitans, archbishops and bishops are taken. Next to them in rank stand the heads of the monasteries and the black clergy under their rule, and on a humbler level are the white or secular clergy, to whom no promotion to the higher ranks lies open.

The Greek Church, like the Roman and the Protestant, entered upon the second half of the seventeenth century with her doctrinal symbols fully matured. She does not, however, make the letter of modern confession obligatory upon the consciences of her people. The Nicene Creed, as revised and enlarged at Constantinople and confirmed at Chalcedon, is her only doctrinal test. That symbol is retained in its purity, without the Latin interpolation touching the procession of the Holy Spirit. No oath or subscription to the Confession or Articles of Bethlehem is required of the clergy. Security against error is sought by maintaining a profound reverence for the ancient traditional teaching of the Church, and in opposing to gainsayers, in case of necessity, the terrors of excommunication. The modern confessions are esteemed only as concisely expressing the meaning of the ancient authorities in relation to the views of the modern world.

Catechisms and other books for ministerial and popular instruction have also been produced in Russia within recent times.

The ritual is in the main the same as that which existed before the schism of Rome. In the number of sacraments (*μυστήρια*) alone does the Greek Church admit that she has followed the example of the Latin, but not in their characteristics and manner of administering them. Baptism they administer by trine immersion—in Russia sprinkling or affusion is allowed—in the name of the Holy Trinity, and grant it to infants, whom they also admit to confirmation and the Eucharist. Holy unction with oil they apply, not in view of death, but as the first means of healing to the sick. The Eucharist is administered by mingling the bread with the wine and giving it to the communicant in a spoon as the very body and blood of the Lord united.

Secular clergy are admitted to the sacrament of marriage, but only once. If a priest's wife dies, he is expected to go into a monastery; if he marries a second time, he renounces the ministry. In confirmation they anoint with oil, and believe that in it the candidate "receives a grace of spiritual growth and strength." In penitence they teach that "he who confesses his sins is on the outward declaration of the priest inwardly loosed from his sins by Jesus Christ himself;" and in orders, that "the Holy Ghost, by the laying on of the bishop's hands, ordains them that be rightly chosen to minister sacraments and to feed the flock of Christ."

Pictures are used in their churches and worshiped

with that degree of worship defined and sanctioned by the Second Council of Nice, if the worshiper knows anything about the distinction or is capable of making it.

The service of the Greek Church is burdened with liturgical forms, with manifold repetitions and readings tediously prolonged.

Nowhere else is the official character of ecclesiastics more distinctly separated from that of the individual. The effect has not been favorable to spiritual religion or morality. Formal connection with the Church and compliance with its observances are held to constitute a full title to the favor of God. Accordingly, nothing can be changed to accommodate any plan of union with either Romanist or Protestant.

CHAPTER XII.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

(1648-1774.)

THE Latin Church in the latter part of the seventeenth century was deeply agitated by a controversy within her own bounds involving a conflict between her ancient standards and her ablest defenders. A book published in 1588 by Louis Molina, a Spanish Jesuit and professor of theology at Eboræ, on the *Concord of Grace and Free-Will*, was received with favor by the order to which its author belonged. Its Pelagianism was attacked by the Dominicans, and a controversy arose on that point. Pope Clement VIII. convoked (1597) a council of divines, called the *Congregatio de Auxiliis*, to examine the subject and reconcile the two powerful orders by adopting forms of statement satisfactory to both. At the end of ten years, and after censuring some propositions of Molina as Pelagian or semi-Pelagian, they dispersed without announcing the result of their deliberations. The pope, Paul V., promised to give his decision at a convenient season, which never arrived. Pelagianism was neither condemned nor expressly accepted by the Catholic Church, and the controversy, though forbidden, could not be stayed.

JANSENISM.

At the end of about forty years debate was quickened to greater activity and took a more definite form in relation to the writings of Cornelius Jansen, bishop of Ypres, and of Jean du Vergier de Hauranne, abbot of St. Cyran. Jansen, who had spent his life in the study of Augustin, at his death left a large work under the name of *Augustinus* devoted to the restoration of the theology of the great Latin Father. The work was published in 1640 in three folio volumes. De Hauranne produced a work of similar extent and purpose on the system of Catholic discipline, which he called *Petrus Aurelius*. It was "approved by the Assembly of the French clergy in 1642," and printed at their expense. Both those learned works sustained Augustinianism as the true doctrine of the Catholic Church.

The Jesuits assailed the *Augustinus*, and in 1642 procured its prohibition by the pope. Its author had died in 1638, and Hauranne was now in prison and near his end; but other champions of the cause arose. At Port-Royal, eighteen miles from Paris, stood a convent founded in the thirteenth century. In 1626 the nuns were removed to another house, in the suburbs of Paris. Their new residence was called "Port-Royal de Paris," and that which they had left "Port-Royal des Champs." The latter, abandoned by the nuns, was twelve years later occupied by certain gentlemen who sought a retreat from the world in order to devote their lives to Christian studies, works of benevolence and devotion. They were known as

the recluses of Port-Royal. Thither retired Arnauld, Nicole, Le Maistre, and others, the greatest defenders of Jansenism and advocates of Augustinian theology. Port-Royal des Champs (in the country) became the citadel of the Jansenists in their protracted warfare with the Jesuits.

In the beginning of the seventeenth century the much-relaxed discipline of the convent of Port-Royal had been reformed by the young abbess Angelica Arnauld. A revival of piety had followed in the nunnery and extended to other monasteries. About the same time a few pious clergymen—among whom St. Cyran stood eminent—had begun to exert a similar influence upon many persons among the populace of Paris, Northern France and the Netherlands. The *Petrus Aurelius* and *Augustinus* were theological effects of that revival; they now stood as fortresses in its defence against Jesuit attack. The subjects of this religious revival constituted the public which sustained the Jansenist theologians.

On the 1st of July, 1649, Nicolas Cornet, syndic of the faculty of theology, laid before the Sorbonne seven heretical propositions—subsequently reduced to five—which he affirmed to be contained in the *Augustinus*. From that date the controversy assumed such proportions as to alarm and agitate the whole Romish Church.

The five propositions were condemned as heretical by a constitution of Innocent X. issued May 31, 1653. It was denied by the Jansenists that those propositions were to be found in the *Augustinus* in the sense thus condemned. The succeeding pope asserted that they

were condemned as "being of Jansen and in the sense of Jansen."

For maintaining what the pope had thus condemned Antony Arnauld was censured by the Sorbonne and deprived of his doctorate. "In the course of two years, more than sixty doctors of the Sorbonne were ejected from that body for refusing to set their names to that act, which they considered one of the grossest injustice."

It was during that trial of Arnauld that the first of the *Provincial Letters* appeared. "Blaise Pascal (their author) was at this time in his thirty-fourth year, and intimately connected not only with Arnauld, but with Nicole, De Sacy and the rest of the recluses at Port-Royal des Champs." "He was the first to arouse public attention and excite public horror by dragging out from the enormous and countless volumes of the casuists the depths of iniquity" which the Jesuits allowed. "The fury which those letters excited in the universities is scarcely to be described. The writer was beyond their reach, but their vengeance might be wreaked on Port-Royal."

A portion of the nuns had returned to the country convent under the abbess Angelica in 1648, and the recluses had "retired to a place called 'Les Granges,' in the immediate neighborhood." They were all alike held by their enemies to be guilty of Augustinian doctrine, whereas Molinism was the creed of the Jesuits.

Pope Alexander VII. maintained in a brief issued in 1656 the ground taken by his predecessor. The Church of France accepted the brief, and framed a formula accordingly, which was to be "signed by all

candidates for ecclesiastical preferment." Thus, the Gallican Church, with the papacy, was enlisted on the side of the Jesuits against the Jansenists, and all who refused to sign the formulary were subjected to persecution. Port-Royal at Paris was put into possession of parties who signed the formulary.

Upon the succession of Clement IX. to the papal chair, in 1667, a reconciliation was effected by the *concordat* which is known as the "Pacification of Clement IX.," granted January 19, 1669. "The recluses of Port-Royal had now liberty to return to their favorite retreat, and there they occupied themselves with those works which have rendered their names immortal." The next twenty-five years were the most productive period of their history.

The controversy reopened in 1696 in reference to the *Moral Reflections on the New Testament*, by Paschasius Quesnel, which had recently appeared, and on the whole breadth of dispute in 1703 by the action of Clement XI. in issuing a bull "renewing all the doctrines of the formulary and making no account whatever of the pacification of Clement IX. The General Assembly of the French clergy received the bull," and the pope, thus sustained, issued, on July 13, 1708, his condemnation of the *Moral Reflections* as infected with Jansenian heresy.

It was now the purpose of its opponents to utterly destroy Jansenism. Port-Royal in the country had been the residence of a number of the most learned and gifted of that persuasion. A papal bull ordered the suppression of the convent. In 1709 the residents were dispersed and consigned to separate prisons.

Everything belonging to it worth removal was transferred to Port-Royal at Paris. The buildings were then demolished (1710), and subsequently (1712) the dead bodies were turned out of their graves and thrown into a pit in one indiscriminate mass.

Other blows continued to be inflicted upon Jansenism through papal agency. On September 8, 1713, appeared the famous constitution *Unigenitus*, in which one hundred and one propositions extracted from the writings of Quesnel were condemned. That act was soon found to be extreme. Only twelve of the propositions could be proved heretical. The constitution, notwithstanding, condemned the whole one hundred and one in the lump. This was disapproved of as unjust by many persons who had no predilections for Jansenism, and for years France was distracted by the disputes between those who opposed and those who defended it. The latter ultimately prevailed, and in 1730 the constitution *Unigenitus* became a law of France.

The subsequent history of Jansenism in that country has been comparatively obscure. In Holland, with the bishop of Utrecht as leader, it has maintained a more consistent life. On the basis of opposition to the *Unigenitus* it became separated from Rome, and so stands to the present day.

QUIETISM.

Mysticism, which had increased in the course of the fifteenth century, found in the sixteenth its most congenial element in the evangelical part of the Reformation. Still, there were some of those devotional spirits

who adhered to the Catholic Church, who loved its forms of worship and venerated its traditions, and in the midst sometimes of much obloquy and suspicion of Protestantism pursued their pious meditations. In the beginning of the seventeenth century that class was honorably represented by Francis de Sales, nominally bishop of Geneva and author of *Philothea*, a favorite devotional book with pious Catholics, and in the succeeding generation by John Sheffler, a German, first a Protestant and afterward a Roman Catholic priest, who added "several sweet and devout hymns" to both communions. The persuasion assumed consistency and form in connection with a book called *The Spiritual Guide*, by Michael de Molinos, a Spanish priest born at Saragossa in 1627. The book was in 1687 condemned by the Inquisition. Molinos was himself imprisoned in a monastery, where he died in 1696. The doctrines of his book were accepted elsewhere, among Protestants as well as in the papal world, especially in France, where they formed a party including the illustrious names of Fénelon and Madame Guyon. They recommended as the true way of life that the "soul should seek to become affectionately one with God by quiet prayer and a complete annihilation of its own independent existence" to the extent of having no concern for its own salvation provided God be glorified.

From their opponents they received the old heretical name of "Quietists." Their doctrine was one of those varieties of mysticism which have appeared from time to time in various periods of the Christian Church—occasionally a true type of Christian piety, and yet in

the case of most people who adopt it involving, if not a pantheistic theology, the serious errors of ignoring a Christian's duty to the world, and spiritual selfishness.

But that certainly was not chargeable upon its two great leaders in France. The writings of Fénelon are known wherever the French language extends. Madame Guyon "traveled many years with her confessor, La Combe, who shared her views, through France and Switzerland, and by means of numerous writings and oral instruction kindled a like burning love to God in the hearts of countless disciples, male and female." In the Romish Church, at the end of the seventeenth century, the pious lives of the Quietists stood out the more distinctly before observation in contrast with the hollow formality prevailing around them and the godlessness of fashionable society. The condemnation which fell upon Molinos followed the Quietists in France. The instigator of it was the Jesuit La Chaise, confessor of Louis XIV. Fénelon read the papal censure of his doctrines from the pulpit in 1699, submitted, and admonished his people to submit, to superior authority.

THE REIGN OF JESUITISM.

The society of Loyola had from the first continued to support, defend and propagate the Romish religion as they found it with a zeal, assiduity and craft which as a mere exploit of intellect and will cannot be contemplated without admiration. Consisting of select men well educated and perfectly trained, with a sufficient number of pious persons among them to give the credit of sanctity to the whole, the order was con-

trolled by a system intolerant, unscrupulous of means and unrelenting. To guide the education of the young, to direct, in the confessional, the consciences of powerful penitents, to wield the policy of nations through sacerdotal influence over the minds of rulers, and to co-operate mysteriously with one another from country to country to these ends, were the favorite methods of the society.

Their most bitter opposition was, of course, directed against Protestants, but their ceaseless intermeddling created greater dislike to them among Romanists. To the papacy in its war with the various forces of reform they had proved an invaluable ally. Their order was the very machinery needed to sustain it when papal practices which no argumentation could defend were still fresh in the minds of men. The papacy was the keystone of a government which could not safely be removed at once, and yet to retain it in force something else than sound reason was needed. The Jesuits brought that something else in blind devotion to its interests, consummate organization, the subtlest craft and a moral theology adapted to the circumstances. They aspired to put themselves at the head of the Catholic people, and thereby to secure the unlimited supremacy of the Romish Church over all states.

Extraordinary success attended their efforts from the first. It culminated in the generalship of Claudius Aquaviva (1581-1615), and of Mutius Vitelleschi (1615-1645); and, although seriously impaired in the Jansenian controversy, it was injured in the first instance morally rather than materially. In the middle of the seventeenth century the Jesuits controlled

the politics of Italy, had established their influence at the court of the emperor and made Vienna, Ingoldstadt and Cologne centres of operation; Treves, Mayence, Spire, Aschaffenburg and Wurtzburg were seats of their colleges, and Munich was the "Rome of Germany." Bohemia they had completely subjugated. Bavaria and Baden were brought under their rule, the Protestant population being compelled to become Roman Catholic or go into exile. Although restrained in France by the policy of Henry IV., they established themselves in Lyons, and even in Paris succeeded in securing an increasing party among the members of the Sorbonne, and in the time of Louis XIV. obtained unrestricted freedom of action and royal co-operation. In Spain opposed by the Dominicans, they succeeded at last in obtaining a foothold at Alcala and Salamanca, from which they gradually extended their movements to the head of the government. In Portugal they were received readily, furnished confessors for the royal family and dictated the policy of the nation. Similarly favored from the first in Belgium, they had their colleges in Courtray, Ypres, Bruges, Antwerp and Brussels, and thence made their way among the Protestants of the United Netherlands. Colleges were established at Douay and Rome "for the benefit of England." To the north Poland was their stronghold, whence invasion was carried into Sweden and Russia, in neither of which it was permanently successful, from both of which it provoked retaliation. Having insinuated themselves into places of influence at different Roman Catholic courts, they artfully wielded the minds of princes and statesmen to the execution of their designs.

They also maintained their missionaries among the heathen, with the intention of building up their order in every nation under heaven.

The sincere piety of many of their brethren it would be the height of uncharitableness to deny, and their plans fill the mind with a sense of grandeur; yet no unprejudiced reader of their history can hesitate to say that the motives of the ruling spirits were profoundly secular: this was the element of their system which in process of time increased, while the spiritual diminished. Some of their foreign missionaries were self-denying, godly men; others were in full sympathy with the ambition of their order. Many of the latter combined to keep before the world a succession of such glowing reports of missionary success, of such numbers of converts, of such scenes of Christian purity and harmony, of such triumphs of the Romish Church among the heathen, as long adorned and upheld Jesuit repute at Rome and throughout Western Europe. Japan, China and India were the scenes of their most boasted triumphs. And if contemplated merely in themselves, the vast attainments, the versatile talents and the long endurance of some of their Indian and Chinese missionaries—such men as Ricci, Adam Schal and De Nobili—were really wonderful.

But reports from more humble-minded and truthful men in course of time got before the European public. Other orders also sent their missionaries to those countries, and complaints increased that the Jesuit converts were only nominal, that the essentials of Christianity were surrendered for the sake of inducing multitudes to assume the name of it and practice a few Catholic

forms which were so adapted to the heathen as to make the practice easy. Closer investigation confirmed these reports. The matter was becoming a public scandal. Orders were sent from Rome by the hand of the papal legate, Tournon, to put a stop to it. Tournon left Europe in 1702, conveyed his message to the Jesuit mission in India, and arrived in China in 1704. The result was unfortunate to himself. At the imperial court of China the missionaries were in favor. Tournon was driven away by the emperor and imprisoned at Macao, where he died in 1710. Controversy arose between the missionaries and the authorities at home, greatly prolonged by the intervening distance and the slow method of travel in those days. The evil did not come to an end until 1742, when Benedict XIV. entirely prohibited the accommodation of Christianity to heathen rites, which was the subject of dispute. The missions forthwith lost their *éclat* and dwindled away. Yet the field was not entirely abandoned. To this day there are remnants of that Jesuit work in China in a community where the name "Christian" is applied to a combination of Romish and heathen observances.

Jesuit missions in Abyssinia enjoyed a similarly splendid success, which was extinguished in their expulsion from the country by an uprising of the native Monophysite population, who in 1632 restored their own Church. In America their work progressed more quietly, being left, except in Paraguay and California, to its own natural results. In every direction those results have proved to be little better than heathenism among the ignorant and provocation to

infidelity to the intelligent. Perhaps the least corrupted by their principle of accommodation were the missions to North American Indians, though the fruit reaped was certainly small.

The Jansenian controversy, especially the *Provincial Letters* of Pascal, had damaged Jesuitism by exposing its moral character. The public and papal condemnation of their missionary practices also condemned all concerned in them as guilty of falsehood and charlatanism. Meanwhile, their intermeddling in financial and state affairs had become offensive to the governments of Europe, and in some cases intolerable. The Roman Catholic Church divided into two great parties between those who censured and those who defended the Jesuits. Papal elections were thus determined to one side or the other. But the progress of public opinion was adverse to the order. In 1759 all its members resident in Portugal and its dependencies were banished. In 1762 they were expelled from France; in 1766, from Spain and Sicily; and finally, by the act of Clement XIV., in 1773, the order was abolished. The bull *Dominus ac Redemptor* was signed on the 21st of July, 1773, and published on the 16th of August next.

THE PAPACY.

(1648-1774.)

It was in the fourth year of Pope Innocent X. that the Treaty of Westphalia was concluded, against which he protested in vain. He died in 1655. His successor, Alexander VII., had been the chief instigator of the papal denunciation of Jansen, and now by his own

papal authority asserted that the five propositions condemned were to be found in Jansen's book, thereby giving the Jansenists a ground on which to oppose the papacy and yet "maintain themselves as good Catholics." Clement IX., who succeeded him on the 30th of June, 1667, effected a suspension of the controversy between the Jansenists and the Jesuits, accommodated a long-existing dispute with Portugal, and by the "mildness of his government toward the subjects of the ecclesiastical state" procured much honor for his brief pontificate. He died in December, 1669. The next pope, Clement X., eighty years old at his election, filled the chair six years without effecting any event of distinction. Innocent XI. began his reign December 10, 1676, with the purpose to restore the superiority of the spiritual element in his official duties.

The attempt in the case of France led to a controversy which outlived Innocent XI. Louis XIV., in retaliation for papal siding with Spanish interests against France, had made large encroachments upon claims of the papacy within his dominions. His clergy and people stood by him. In 1682 he called a council of the French clergy, which, under the leadership of Bossuet, bishop of Meaux, defined more sharply than ever before the privileges of the Gallican Church. The king persecuted his Protestant subjects and enforced Catholicism, but refused submission to the pope. He maintained his minister at Rome by force of arms, in contempt of the papal regulations, and even disposed of ecclesiastical benefices within the bounds of France by his own will. The pope would not be propitiated by holocausts of Huguenots, and joined his influence to

an alliance, including the Protestants of Holland, to reduce the orthodox monarch to order.

Alexander VIII. was elected on the 6th of October, 1689. A beginning was made in reconciling the difficulty with France, but before peace was concluded the pope died, February 1, 1691. His successor, Innocent XII., concluded the peace with France. He also prudently avoided a quarrel with the emperor, while defending the vassals in the ecclesiastical states against his unjust aggression. No pope was more fortunate in having his censure of heresy complied with than he in the submission of the Quietist Fénelon. Innocent XII. died September 27, 1700.

Clement XI. was elected on the 3d of November next, and reigned twenty-one years. One of his first transactions was to oppose the erection of Prussia into a kingdom, to which the party concerned paid no regard. Still more was the feebleness of the papacy in temporal things exhibited in the war of the Spanish Succession. Professing to stand neutral, Clement was accused by both parties of befriending their enemies. The French secured from him the recognition of Philip, grandson of Louis XIV., as king of Spain. The Austrians afterward entered his territories and constrained him to annul that recognition and substitute the name of their candidate, the archduke Charles. And in the settlement which closed that war countries regarded by the pope "as his fiefs, such as Sicily and Sardinia," were consigned to new sovereigns without his advice or consent being even requested." If he offended the Jesuits by his censure of their missions in China and India, they were still too strong to be broken by it, and

he gave them ample satisfaction by the blow inflicted on the Jansenists.

Upon the death of Clement XI., in 1721, Innocent XIII. succeeded, and reigned three years.

Controversy on the subject of the Jesuit missions, in which the opposition was led by the Dominicans, was now agitating the Roman Catholic Church. Benedict XIII., himself a Dominican monk, was raised to the pontificate in the interest of the Dominican party. His reign was marked by a pacific attitude toward the Greek and Protestant Churches, with a view to reconcile them with the Roman Church; but he left a greater reputation for virtue and learning than for the wisdom or prosperity of his administration.

Clement XII., who succeeded in 1730, spent the ten years of his reign in fruitless attempts to repress the growth of religious liberty and to retain the reality of papal prerogatives, which the civil powers could no longer allow. In these efforts he embroiled himself successively with the courts of France, Austria and Spain, and consumed much of his time in contentions from which it was impossible that he could emerge with credit.

In 1740, Benedict XIV. succeeded to the chair thus diminished in power, and by a course of moderation procured for it more respect than the most exorbitant claims of his predecessors could compel. He endeavored to establish a wise economy in the administration of his estates, and acquired by his tolerant spirit the esteem of all Europe. When his territories were invaded, his utmost efforts were laid out to repair the damage thereby inflicted upon the people.

Of the conclusive effect with which he rebuked the Jesuit proceedings in India and China mention has already been made.

Clement XIII., elected in 1758 in the interest of the Jesuits, used every effort to avert the effects of that unpopularity which had settled down upon them. His efforts were fruitless and exposed to imminent hazard the authority of his own office. It was within his pontificate that the Jesuits were expelled from Portugal, France, Spain and Naples. The anti-Jesuit party elected his successor, who took the papal name of "Clement XIV." For the interests of the papacy in that crisis no better choice could have been made. Jesuits for two hundred years had put themselves forward as its defenders, and its reputation was largely associated with theirs. It had never submitted to recognize indebtedness to their support, and had occasionally reprovved their practices ; but had it persisted in defending them, it could not have escaped serious diminution of respect. And yet for the head of the papacy to array himself against his own janizaries was a daring act. But to that act Clement XIV. was found equal. He was elected in 1769, abolished the Jesuit order in 1773, and died in 1774. The order created for conflict with Protestants he had doomed a failure.

Upon the whole, the course of papal history from 1648 to 1774 was that of a fluctuating decline. The talents and virtues of one or two popes could only retard the downward progress. And the declining secular power dragged with it that which more properly belonged to ecclesiastical relations. Wise and bold as was the act of Clement XIV. whereby he severed his

office from the Jesuits, it came too late to avert all the calamities so nearly ripened.

STATE OF RELIGION AND INTELLIGENCE IN THE
ROMISH CHURCH.

As every attempt to revive a purer doctrine or more spiritual life in the Romish Church evoked a bitter opposition and conflict, practical piety was confined within exceedingly narrow bounds. The effect was to establish formalism in full authority, under cover of which infidelity prevailed most where intelligence was greatest. In a ritual service not designed for instruction, and in which the people are only lookers-on, reason finds little to take hold of, and soon wearies and drops the theme altogether. Piety, in order to be warm, earnest and healthy, must have a degree of freedom. All Christians do not learn Christ in precisely the same way and through the same light. The evil which resulted was greatest in France—of all Catholic countries, that in which intellect was then most active.

In France the philosophy of Locke was accepted and carried out with a logical abandon truly French to conclusions from which its English author would have shrunk in horror, and which were turned as weapons against all religion in the spirit of a frivolous and scoffing ridicule.

From the time of Charlemagne the Gallican Church had been recognized as laying claim to a certain degree of freedom under papal rule. The great points of Gallicanism, as set forth by Bossuet and the national assembly of French clergy under Louis XIV. in 1682,

are four: 1. That kings are independent of the ecclesiastical powers in temporal matters; 2. That a General Council is a higher authority than the pope; 3. That the ancient laws and customs of the Gallican Church are inviolable; and 4. That even in matters of faith the pope is not infallible, except with the concurrence of the Church. As all these were directly opposed to Jesuitism, the later success of that order in France had operated to sustain a party in opposition to the national usages.

To laymen capable of comprehending the order and nature of the causes at work it became impossible to respect what was ordinarily put before them for Christianity, and to men who looked no farther disbelief was inevitable. There can be no doubt that piety in that Church at that time prevailed chiefly among the ignorant and was protected by their ignorance. A tremendous calamity was before a nation when so large a portion of it lay in that condition.

And yet there was no lack of organization for such piety as was recognized and allowable. The regular service, though not so cumbrous as that of the Greek Church, was very copious; and if attendance upon it did not suffice a troubled conscience, there were various monastic orders into one or other of which, if a penitent felt moved thereto, he would find little difficulty in obtaining admittance. With the view of meeting the utmost of such demands, the more recently constituted orders were the most severe. Such was the revived order of La Trappe, and such the orders of the Redemptorists, and the "Sodality of the Devotion of the Heart of Jesus." Orders were also instituted for

the purpose of educating youth in consistency with the doctrines and practices of the Roman Church. To that the Redemptorists gave much of their attention, and it was the sole object of the order of La Salle (*Fratres ignorantiae*). The new orders had all a view to the confining of piety to prescribed channels and the severe exaction of compliance with the ordinances of the Church.

The intellectual activity of the time found honorable representatives among Roman Catholics, especially of France. The Benedictines of the Congregation of St. Maur continued their learned labors, which in a historical point of view are of great value. Others employed themselves in editing works of the ancient Fathers and other relics of Christian antiquity. Many of the Jesuits were men of great learning and ability, and many of unquestionable piety. It was the time of the theologians Bona and Noris and the antiquarian Muratori in Italy, and of the historians Mabillon and Du Pin in France. The illustrious writers of Port-Royal have already been mentioned.

It was also within the same period that the best preachers of the Gallican Church flourished, at the head of whom stand the great names of Bourdaloue, Bossuet, Flechier and Massillon. Among Romish biblical scholars appeared Simon, Calmet and Houbigant.

The Catholic literature of Spain was comparatively scanty, and the best intellectual activity of Germany was given to the cause of Protestantism.

CHAPTER XIII.

POLITICAL CHANGES AFFECTING THE CHURCHES.

THE form of government prevailing in the period just considered was absolute monarchy, and the principal powers were France and Spain—the former in its prime, and the latter declining. Next were England, the Empire and Sweden. France and Spain were Romish; England and Sweden, Protestant. The imperial dynasty was Romish, but Germany was divided. The smaller Protestant states, Western Switzerland and Holland, added to the weight of Northern Germany and Sweden, formed on the Continent an interest opposed, but not in itself of equal strength, to the great Romish powers when combined. England during all the latter half of the seventeenth century, with exception of a few years under Cromwell, was wholly occupied with her own internal affairs, and did not again become a great European power until so constituted by the policy of William III. From that date she gradually assumed the position of a leader on the Protestant side, bringing thereby the two parties more nearly to an equal balance. The prime point of international policy was to maintain a balance among the great powers.

Charles II. of Spain died in the last year of the seventeenth century without an heir. In him ended

the Spanish branch of the house of Hapsburg. A contest ensued for the succession between the Austrian Hapsburg and a branch of the Bourbons in the person of a grandson of Louis XIV.—Philip of Anjou. France and her allies defended the claim of Philip, while Austria with her allies, including England, Holland, Savoy and Portugal, maintained that of the archduke Charles. The war closed with putting Philip on the throne, but with great limitations and the loss of all the Italian states—Lombardy, Milan, Sardinia, Naples and Sicily, which had belonged to Spain.

In that war, distinguished by the exploits of Marlborough and Prince Eugene, and lasting from 1701 to 1713, the duke of Savoy, Victor Amadeus, though he first joined France, soon changed and fought on the side of Austria. His reward was the enlargement of his narrow dominions at the expense of the allies of France in Northern Italy and the annexation of Sicily, taken from Spain. With that extension of territory he was honored with the title of "king." Austria got the rest of the Spanish states in Italy. Four years afterward Victor Amadeus accepted Sardinia in exchange for Sicily.

During the occupation of the great powers with the war of the Polish Succession (1733 and 1734), Don Carlos, a son of the Bourbon king of Spain, and duke of Parma and Placentia in right of his mother, led a Spanish force into Naples and took possession of both it and Sicily. Under arrangements of the succeeding peace he was allowed to retain his conquest on condition of surrendering Parma and Placentia to Austria.

Thus the dukes of Savoy became kings, one Bour-

bon was placed on the throne of Spain and another on that of Naples and Sicily, while the house of Austria held the best part of Northern Italy.

In the North the little state of Prussia—made a kingdom in 1701—was gradually enlarging her bounds, to which important additions were made, with a still greater addition of military strength, in the reign of Frederick II., who came to the throne in 1740.

Russia, champion of the Greek Church, also continued her course of territorial enlargement, especially to the east and the south. Poland, lying between Russia, Prussia and Austria, was distracted by internal dissensions. Russian arms were now in condition to retaliate invasion in the interest of Greek Catholicism. Austria had an interest in protecting Roman Catholics, and Prussia Protestants. A treaty was concluded (1773) by those three powers for the dismemberment of Poland, the greater part of which they divided among themselves, and occupied their respective portions by force of arms.

The Venetians, who had long held dominion in Southern Greece, were finally expelled from that country in 1718, when it came entirely into the hands of the Turks, and Venice ceased to be a power of any importance. Her superiority in trade was already lost.

All the great political and military changes tended relatively to diminish the Romish and build up the Protestant states, and to some degree also the Greek. A new and strong kingdom was added to the Protestant connection. The number of Romish kingdoms remained the same. If Poland was absorbed, Sardinia was set up.

In brief, the secular changes of the time most deeply affecting the progress of religion were :

1. The Peace of Westphalia (1648).
2. The English Commonwealth (1649-1660).
3. The English Revolution (1688-90).
4. The war of the Spanish Succession, which reduced the power of both France and Spain, the greatest and most relentless champions of religious intolerance (1701, 1713-14).
5. The erection of Prussia into a kingdom (1701).
6. The union of England and Scotland (1707).
7. The rise to royalty of the dukes of Savoy—a dynasty ordained to set the example of freedom in religion among Romanists and to unite Italy.

THE SPIRIT OF RECENT RELIGIOUS PROGRESS.

Ancient civilization leaned to art; the modern gives prominence to science; and the only culture proper to the Middle Ages was shaped by sacerdotal constraint. In another light, the activity of the human mind was shown in ancient times chiefly by constructiveness; in the Middle Ages, by credulity; and in the modern is determined by criticism. At all times of any note in human history there are two moral forces in operation, the conservative and the progressive. In modern Church history these are each subdivided. The two progressive forces are evangelism and rationalism; the two conservative are literal orthodoxy and ritualism. Each side has its extremes. Rationalism is followed by infidelity, and honest ritualism by superstition. There is a perfunctory ritualism which is only a screen for unbelief.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE PROTESTANT CHURCHES FROM THE PEACE OF WESTPHALIA TO THE EVE OF THE FRENCH REV- OLUTION.

LUTHERANISM.

As France in the eighteenth century exhibited the greatest mental activity of Romanism, so Germany presented the principal arena of Lutheranism.

During their first one hundred and twenty years truth of doctrine was earnestly sought and carefully defined and inculcated by the adherents of the Augsburg Confession, but subsequently the truth defined was accepted as an end to inquiry, and laxity prevailed. The Thirty Years' war, though waged in the cause of religion, was prejudicial to the higher religious interests, and in its close the Lutheran Church, rejoicing in her independence, forgot that anything else remained to be won. Amid the religious coldness which succeeded, and the deep and widely-prevailing godlessness in general society, a few persons united themselves in an effort to bring their own minds more immediately into contact with the Scriptures. Their meetings were commenced in 1670, at the instance and under the direction of Philip Jacob Spener, a zealous and devoted pastor at Frankfort-on-the-Main. In 1686 he carried the same efforts to Dresden, where he was appointed

court-preacher, and in 1691 to Berlin. Thus arose the

PIETIST REVIVAL.

In 1695 the Wittenberg divines charged Spener with heresy and denounced two hundred and sixty-four errors which they professed to have found in his writings. He and his friends defended themselves, and so arose the Pietist controversy. Spener died in 1705, but the revival went on in the hands of others, among whom the most conspicuous was A. H. Francke. A large party sustained the cause, and in 1694 the University of Halle was founded in its interest.

It was whilst Jansenism was laboring to revive orthodoxy in the Roman Catholic Church, and the Quietists were earnestly seeking "a closer walk with God," that the Pietist revival arose, in a similar spirit, but in more favorable circumstances of healthier and fuller growth and productive of more abundant fruit. Halle became the centre of its operations—more than its Port-Royal. In addition to the university, Francke there established an orphan-school, which soon became a great educational institute and before his death, in 1727, numbered over twenty-two hundred pupils. Fellow-laborers with Francke in the university were Breithaupt, Lange, Anton and Wolf, and as inspectors of the school successively the Baumgartens, father and son. For forty years from the beginning of its university Halle continued to be a fountain of healthy Christian activity. And yet within the same time the seeds were planted there of another growth, which subsequently divided her instructions.

Christian Wolf commenced his illustrious philosoph-

ical career in 1703, and became professor in Halle in 1707. Desirous of securing the utmost clearness and certainty in the conception and presentation of truth, he adopted a severe mathematical method, and in treating of religion laid down as first principles certain conditions which he held must characterize a revelation. Some of his disciples carried these *a-priori* assumptions to a greater length than he, and undertook to prove the absolute necessity of a revelation and "vicarious satisfaction for mankind" and the truth of separate doctrines revealed in the Bible. Thus human reason began to "assume the position of a judge rather than an interpreter of Scripture."

Rejected at first by the Pietists, that philosophy, in course of time combining with their opinion that the regenerated heart is to judge of the spiritual meaning of Scripture by its own feelings, led many of them astray under both heads. The persuasion grew up and widely prevailed that the reason of man is able to discover what is true in divine things, that it has a test for the teaching of revelation in its own *a-priori* determinations and the feelings of the pious heart. The exercise of such criticism could not be limited to men spiritually prepared to appreciate divine truth.

About the same time a third element was introduced, which, although adverse to the spirit of Pietism in its humble and implicit faith, combined with and hastened the development of the error taking root in it. The influx of the doctrines of deism from England had, both directly and indirectly, great effect upon German opinion. On one point the earlier deists coincided with the Pietists and the Wolfian

philosophy—namely, in addressing their criticism to the substance of Scripture. Their attack upon its evidences came in later, and its substance was always their principal aim.

At the point of time when these elements had united in giving birth to a new style of thinking about revelation an improved science of hermeneutics appeared, which that new style of thinking forthwith applied or perverted to its purpose. That method may be dated from the publication of the *Institutes* of interpretation of the New Testament by Ernesti, in 1761. Its rules for determining the meaning of words and phrases were soon turned as an instrument to the discussion of the whole substance of Scripture. The method underwent some modification as applied by Michaelis to the Hebrew Scriptures, and in the hands of Semler, combined with his theory of the canon, undermined the structure of inspiration and left the purport of Scripture to be determined by accommodation to the different ideas of successive ages through which it has come.

RATIONALISM.

All the agencies thus combined were initiated by men of real piety, and yet the result proved to be one of the coldest varieties of Christian rationalism. The style of thinking which grew up in the seventeenth century and first years of the eighteenth in philosophical succession through Des Cartes, Liebnitz and Wolf received a new ingredient from connection with English philosophy—an ingredient which tended to confine it to the limits of the outer senses and results of their experience.

To begin thinking from a point beyond which thought cannot go, to think clearly in sequence and to reach thereby reliable conclusions in religion, morals and existence generally, was the exalted purpose of those great men. In religion, as in everything else, there was no starting-point, no basis of authority, save the axioms which were assumed as the foundation of all thinking. Experience was assumed as furnishing the material and reason as the capacity and arbiter of truth. The stay and direction of Scripture was virtually and of necessity set aside, or admitted only in as far as consistent with the philosophic system.

"Truth," said Liebnitz, "is that which does not contradict itself, and for which a sufficient reason can be adduced." The former principle proves that a given proposition is possible; the latter, that it expresses a reality.

Reason was accepted as the natural sense of truth, and clearness as the criterion of truth. After the introduction of Locke's ideas common sense took the place of reason, or reason came to be used in the meaning of common sense, and experience was content with a lower and narrower position than Locke had designed for it.

Thus the popular philosophy which succeeded Wolf's and reigned alone from the middle to the end of the eighteenth century stood upon the narrow platform of sense-experience and accepted common sense as the criterion of all truth. Employed in the exposition of Scripture and of the doctrines of Christianity, it constituted, with the other elements already men-

tioned, the common rationalism of the eighteenth century, and in the service of unbelief it was the logical power of the infidel. At the same time, it was the philosophy of all classes, believers and unbelievers. By believers it was deemed as orthodox as the gospel, and all defences of Scripture were constructed in accordance with it and by its means. Whatever might be a man's spiritual experience, he felt bound when philosophizing to reduce all higher things to a few common elements, and claimed no recognition for an original existence of that inner power which possesses the discernment of spiritual things—the intuition belonging to that faith which is the gift of God.

Philosophers and theologians stood on the same philosophic ground with the deists, and the education of the young was conducted on the assumption that it was the only philosophy consistent with Christian profession. Ministers of the gospel thought it the most effective way of interpreting and defending Scripture, and deists fearlessly applied it to refute all revelation and to show that no testimony is competent to sustain it. The weakness of the very party in the Church which opposed the low rationalism of the day consisted in standing upon the same philosophic ground.

Through the co-operation of those agencies upon the popular mind, but still more upon the educated; through the literature growing up in their spirit and the fashionable style of preaching,—rationalism reached its full development ere the last quarter of the eighteenth century began, and threatened to be utterly subversive of everything in religion above what man can do for himself.

The spirit of rationalism was far from new, but a new form of it was thus developed, according to which ministers of the Christian Church were no longer witnesses for Christ, but philosophers to demonstrate a common-sense theology, and to enforce it by so explaining Scripture as to exclude everything above the measure of common experience.

Halle itself, after the death of its first set of professors, began to divide into parties, one of which passed over to rationalism, while the other went to an opposite extreme of unscientific mysticism. For a time the latter prevailed, but subsequently, toward the end of the century, and far into the next, the university came almost entirely under the control of rationalists.

But even when Pietism had become degenerate at its centre, the benign influence exerted by it was still alive in connection with other kindred movements. It moulded some of the finest products of German literature and quickened pastoral labor in many a quarter where its presence was not recognized. Its gentle and kindly liberality obtained admission for it with a few German Catholics. In this direction, however, the history of religion becomes personal and without organization.

A more important outgrowth of Pietism was that which gave and received support from union with the remnant of the Bohemian Brethren.

THE MORAVIANS.

In the Thirty Years' war the calamities which fell upon the Bohemian Protestants were largely shared by the Moravians, who were counted with them. Great

numbers suffered death ; their churches were destroyed ; their schools were closed and their Bibles and other religious books burned beneath the gallows. For a long time their community barely survived in a state of deep depression. At the beginning of the eighteenth century Bohemia and Moravia were completely under the papal yoke. In that depth of its calamities the remnant of those suffering churches had provided for it the friend who established it upon a peaceful and secure foundation.

One of the pupils of the orphan-house at Halle, Louis, Count Zinzendorf, becoming acquainted with the doctrines and sufferings of that much-persecuted people, offered a remnant of their community a settlement and protection on his estates at Berthelsdorf, in Upper Lusatia. They gladly accepted the offer, and collected in such number as to make a little village. Their first settlement, at the place called "Herrnhut," was made in 1722, and in 1728 they accepted the terms proposed to them by Count Zinzendorf, and were organized, as the renewed Church of the United Brethren, in accordance with his views, as a missionary Church. In 1735 the count himself became their bishop, ordained by a Moravian bishop at Berlin. Banished from Saxony, with a few companions he visited the nations of Northern Europe, looking after the remnants of their communion, now widely dispersed. In 1741 he visited America, set on foot the Moravian system of missions to the Indians and founded the schools of Bethlehem, Nazareth and Lititz in Pennsylvania, and Salem in North Carolina. In 1748 he finally obtained from the ecclesiastical council of Electoral Saxony the recognition of his congregations as con-

nected with the churches professing the Augsburg Confession. By the influence of Archbishop Potter the British Parliament in 1749 enacted that the Church of the United Brethren was to be respected as a Protestant Episcopal Church. Some of them were already residents of England and formed a congregation in London.

With some serious mistakes at first, which were subsequently corrected or softened down, that little body of Christians had already entered upon their efforts for the conversion of the world. In 1732 their missionaries went to Greenland; in 1734, to Lapland; in 1736, to the negroes in Georgia; in the same year, to the Hottentots; in 1737, to the coast of Guinea; in 1739, to the negroes in South Carolina; also in that year, to Algiers; in 1740, to Ceylon, to the Jews at Amsterdam and to the gypsies; and from the time of Zinzendorf's visit to America missions were established among the Indians.

Thus, although the theology of Pietism was divided and underwent some change, its originally benign impulses extended far in various directions. In 1815 the University of Wittenberg was removed and joined to that of Halle, which has recently been greatly revived.

THE WOLFENBÜTTEL FRAGMENTS.

On the side of rationalism an important event occurred in the year 1774. The first number of a series of articles was published by Lessing as the work of an unknown author found in the library of Wolfenbüttel. The rest appeared at different times from 1774 to 1778 as separate fragments, and were

subsequently found to have been found written by Professor Reimarus, of Hamburg, who had died in 1768.

The Wolfenbüttel Fragments argued in defence of rationalism and against the possibility of a revelation which should possess sufficient evidence to render it worthy of universal confidence, and endeavored to explain away all that was out of the ordinary course of nature in the life of Jesus. They were the matured fruit of a style of thinking which for more than a whole generation had been growing up by the development and union of various agencies. The philosophy which admitted only common experience, and tested all by the decisions of mere common sense, and accepted as true that alone which coincided clearly with their measure, was of course as incapable of grasping revelation as a child's hand is incapable of grasping a sunbeam.

Great opposition was made to the Fragments, but their opponents were furnished with no efficient weapon, for they all used the same method and admitted the same philosophic principles. Christians, then as always, knew in some degree the existence of a spiritual experience within them which had not arisen there in the ordinary course of nature, and which was as real to them as the information of the senses; but it was not within the range of their philosophy. Every advantage in debate was therefore on the side of the unbeliever, and the believer rested upon what his philosophy took no cognizance of. The Fragments are important as serving to mark an epoch of rationalist progress. It had declared itself.

SWEDENBORGIANISM.

In the history of the Lutheran churches in the Scandinavian countries the most remarkable event was the rise of Swedenborgianism, which had no peculiar relation to the Lutheran doctrine, inasmuch as it claimed to be a new revelation setting the whole of the foregoing in a new light.

Emmanuel von Swedenborg was a Swedish gentleman of great learning and science who from 1743, when he was fifty-four years of age, separated himself from all secular pursuits, including high official position under the government of Sweden, to devote himself to religious studies. He removed to London, where he wrote most of his mystic works, and died in 1772, at an advanced age.

Swedenborg professed that in the year 1743 his eyes had been opened to see into the spiritual world, and that he had received the gift of understanding the language of angels, retaining it to the end of his days—that he had enjoyed revelations directly from the Lord, and had been admitted into heaven.

In Scripture he distinguished two meanings—the natural and the spiritual, the latter enclosed in the former and corresponding to the state of things in heaven. A number of Scripture books he rejected as not inspired. Other things upon earth have also their correspondences in heaven, which, relieved from earthly grossness, are in form and relatively to their surroundings the same as those upon earth. He taught that there is only one life, which is God, and all the divine Trinity was contained in Christ. He re-

jected the doctrine of original sin—held man to be free, but exposed to the influences of good and evil spirits and indebted to God for all the good that belongs to him. According to his doctrine, justification is not by faith alone. The man who has charity “fears God and works righteousness, whatever his religious sentiments may be, will be saved.” Each true believer contains the Church in himself. The outer Church is a society composed of persons in each of whom the Church is, and its name, under his revelations, is “the Church of the New Jerusalem.” The last judgment is already over—it occurred in the year 1757—and the New Jerusalem predicted in the Apocalypse has descended in the form of the New Church.

The visions of Swedenborg took with certain minds as a relief, in the opposite extreme, from prevailing rationalism, and were the more acceptable that certain threads of rationalism were interwoven with them.

CHAPTER XV.

THE REFORMED CHURCHES.

OF the Reformed Church a great many divisions might be made, but closer inspection discovers that real grounds of difference are much fewer than they seem. The broadest and most obvious is that which exists in reference to government between the prelatic and the Presbyterian. On that scale they may be classified as follows :

I. PRELATIC.

1. The English Established Church.
2. The Irish Episcopal Church.
3. The Episcopal Church in Scotland.
4. The Episcopal Churches of the British colonies.
5. And the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, retaining the diocesan episcopacy without the metropolitan rank and the primacy.

II. PRESBYTERIAN.

A. *On the plan of government by Presbyters and organic union of churches.*

1. The National Established Church of Holland.
2. The Established Churches of Protestant Switzerland.

3. The Reformed Church of France.
 4. The German Reformed Churches, in as far as not united with the Lutheran.
 5. The Reformed Church of Hungary, associated with the Lutheran in the same country.
 6. The Established Church of Scotland, with all its branches in England and the British colonies; also its dissenters and the Free Church of Scotland.
 7. The Presbyterian Churches in Ireland.
 8. The Presbyterian Churches in America, including the descendants of various European nationalities.
- B. *On the plan of government by Presbyters, but without organization in Presbyteries.*
1. Independents.
 2. Baptists, who in government are Independents.
 3. Congregationalists.
 4. Methodists, except one branch in the United States and its colonies or missions.
- C. *On the plan of combining some elements of the Episcopal and Presbyterian systems.*
1. The Methodist Episcopal Church of America.
 2. The Moravians and Waldenses, who began their history prior to the Reformation, but are to be classed with the Reformed Churches on this scale.

In respect to *doctrine*, the Reformed Churches take their stand upon the ancient Catholic orthodoxy of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed and the theology of Augustin, which latter they have further described

and expounded. The variations from that standard have been chiefly in the direction of Arminian, Pelagian or Unitarian doctrine. But their dismembered condition is mainly due to the violent persecutions to which in most countries they were long subjected, and from the effects of which they have not yet entirely recovered.

PROTESTANTISM IN HUNGARY.

While the Protestants of Bohemia and Moravia were in the issue of the Thirty Years' war almost entirely crushed, those of Hungary proved too numerous and strong for Jesuitical success. Through the skill and noble firmness of their leader, Prince Bethlen, the worst effects of that war were averted, and subsequently, under the Transylvanian Rakotzy, in 1645, they secured the recognition of their religious rights by the Treaty of Linz. It could not, however, be completely carried into effect. When the war closed, the Catholic clergy and the Jesuits—whose power was then reaching its prime—combined with the king and the army to exterminate the Protestants. That severity continued from the accession of Leopold, in 1657, until his death, in 1705, kept in check to some degree and for a short time by the prince-palatine Venelényi Hadad. The reign of Joseph I. was more lenient. His early death was a serious loss to the Protestants. They, however, obtained a renewed admission of rights soon after, in the Peace of Szathmar, May 10, 1711, which was put in force when Charles VI. came to the throne (1712), but not without much interruption by the Jesuits and Romish bishops. Maria Theresa from

1741 sustained the Jesuits, and persecution was renewed and continued through all her sole reign. When her son, Joseph II., began to assist in the government, oppression had some limit put to it. Soon afterward the Jesuit order was abolished.

The reforms made by Joseph II. after his mother's death, though from the brevity of his reign lacking time to mature, were a great benefit to the whole empire. But they were far in advance of the age; and when he died, in 1790, his brother, Leopold II., who succeeded him on the throne for two years, alone appreciated and labored to maintain them. Leopold II. died 1792, while the first scenes of the great Revolution were being acted in France. The next heir of the Austrian empire, Francis II., allowed the old ecclesiastical despotism, as far as was practicable, to creep back into its place. Through all his reign he answered complaints with promises which he never made an effort to keep until it became impossible had he wished it.

THE CHURCH OF GENEVA.

In the seventeenth century orthodoxy was still taught in the schools and preached in the churches of Geneva. Francis Turretin died in 1688. It seemed as if he had built up defences of the truth which could never be broken down. Dependence upon his work more than upon the direct lessons of Scripture may have had something to do with the subsequently diminished effect of that work. His gifted son, J. Alfons Turretin, silently drifted in the direction of Unitarianism, and after his death (1737) the progress was rapid. Before the end of the century Arian

and Socinian doctrines had "usurped the pulpits of Calvin and Beza." It was a change effected by the working of the same popular philosophy which was bringing about similar changes elsewhere.

Moreover, some of the leaders of French deism were connected with Geneva or its vicinity, and helped forward the causes working to that end. Such were Rousseau and Voltaire, to whom may be added the Englishman Gibbon, who spent the best part of his days on the shores of the Lake of Geneva. The ministers of that canton, it is true, condemned the godlessness of Rousseau, and thereby provoked his scathing criticism of themselves, but they were not in condition to encounter him on the solid ground of Scripture faith and doctrine. The two great French deists died in the same year—1778—and the Englishman in 1794.

THE REFORMED CHURCH OF FRANCE.

The Edict of Nantes, in which Henry IV. granted toleration to Protestants in France, was revoked in 1685. It was at an enormous sacrifice of the national industry that Louis XIV. granted that favor to Jesuit policy. When he found his skilled artisans leaving the country by hundreds and thousands, he applied violence to retain them, waylaying them by detachments of military; yet at least half a million of his most valuable subjects, whom he had outlawed, found their way to Holland, Switzerland, England, America and other countries. Those who remained in France were subjected to every annoyance conceivable, with the view of harassing them into the acceptance of

Romanism. Their sufferings excited and disordered the minds of many. Fanatics arose among them, known in England as "the French prophets." In Languedoc they organized resistance, and under the name of "Camisards" successfully defended themselves with arms for twenty years. In 1704 they laid down their arms upon receiving fair promises, and their leader, John Cavalier, and others entered the king's service. Cavalier afterward removed to England. Whatever were his expectations of relief to his followers, they were not realized. Persecution went on. Protestants were harassed by dragonnades; many of them were put to death, and their churches were seized or destroyed. And yet, after all, some two millions of the French people remained attached to the Reformed Church. Wherever the exiles took refuge they proved to be a valuable addition to the industry and moral character of the population.

The injury to France appeared in various ways. The morals of the people degenerated; their intellectual freedom declined; the national superiority in manufactures came to an end; and the guilty king's success in arms began to waver, until, after repeated defeats, in the prolonged war of the Spanish Succession, he was constrained to beg for peace, and escaped the most humiliating terms only by a cabal in the council of his enemies.

Louis XV. succeeded his grandfather in 1715, and retained the throne sixty years, during the whole of which time the Huguenots were out of the protection of law. Their Church was in the desert. By the royal declaration of 1729 the penalty for preaching the

gospel was death, and for affording comfort or shelter to the preachers imprisonment or the galleys.

In the end of the comparatively lenient administration of Fleury (1743) the Reformed of France made a heroic attempt to collect their energies and held their first national synod. The activity of persecution was forthwith renewed, and continued with greater or less violence all the rest of the reign of Louis XV.

The more humane character of Louis XVI., who came to the throne in 1774, and the more rational sentiments beginning to prevail in society, tended to lighten the weight of oppression. But it was not until Louis XVI. had been in power twelve years that any action was taken to remove the disabilities of his Protestant subjects. In 1787 an edict which met with great opposition in the French Parliament was issued, granting them the right to meet for public worship, and to hold and bequeath property. But for that they were indebted, not to any relaxation of Romish intolerance nor to royal favor, but to the rising tide of rationalism, which soon afterward broke the complex tyranny and scattered its distinctions to the waves.

THE REFORMED CHURCH OF HOLLAND.

By action of the General Synod of Dort (1618-19), Calvinism was strongly maintained in the Dutch Reformed Church in opposition to Arminianism, which was defined as heresy. The Remonstrants, as the Arminian party were called, from the remonstrance presented by them to the states-general of Holland in 1610, though greatly in the minority, did not cease to be an important religious sect, and in course of time

were morally strengthened by adherents to their doctrines elsewhere.

The five heads of doctrine of the Synod of Dort thenceforward continued to be the theological standards of the Church of Holland. They treat of divine predestination, of the death of Christ in its sufficiency to save sinners, of the depravity of human nature, of its regeneration and redemption by sovereign grace, and of the perseverance of the saints.

The period from 1618 to 1775 was one of active theological discussions, and deep into the heart of them entered the Cartesian philosophy. Essentially skeptical, it was condemned by the states-general in 1656, but could not by such action be excluded from individual thinking. Baruch Spinoza, a Jew of Portuguese parentage, born at Amsterdam in 1632 (d. 1677), created also some sensation by his system of pantheism, but wrought less harm in Holland than in Germany.

The ablest adversary of Descartes was Voëtius, professor of theology at Utrecht (d. 1677), the advocate of an elaborate scholasticism introduced by Maccopius, professor of theology at Franeker (d. 1644), which went to make the whole subject of religion a branch of philosophy on the basis of the Calvinistic system.

That, however, created a reaction from the side of those who apprehended its effects in a hard formalizing of everything, alike in science and in religious life. John Cocceius, professor at Franeker and Leyden (d. 1669), labored to bring theology back to the Scriptures, and instituted what has been called "the Federal

Theology," from the fundamental ideas which it presented of a "twofold covenant of God with man." His system was further developed by his followers Burmann, Heidanus and Witsius. Thus the main current of debate for a hundred years was determined by the systems of Voëtius and Cocceius. Political parties sought their aid, supporters of the prince of Orange taking sides with the Voëtians and the liberal republicans with the Cocceians.

Among the Arminians the most gifted and learned in the first half of the seventeenth century was Hugo Grotius (d. 1645), who amid his many political and legal labors found time to write with much effect in defence of the Christian religion.

The seventeenth century and the first and greater part of the eighteenth constituted to Holland her most illustrious period of theological and classical scholarship. Her universities were then in their prime. With their strict standard of orthodoxy and their liberal toleration, the United Provinces became a safe asylum for religious refugees from persecution in other lands.

But the influx of deism from England and of atheism from France ultimately proved stronger than the barriers erected against them. As a result of German rationalism of the Kantian as well as common-sense type, in accordance with which most of the ministers learned to think, the orthodox faith began to be preached "in a cold and lifeless manner."

It was a melancholy view which the continent of Europe presented to the Christian at the opening of the last quarter of the eighteenth century.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE RATIONALIST REVOLUTION.

(Since 1790.)

WE have arrived at the verge of a great juncture in the history of Christendom—a point upon which many potent and far-spreading causes have concentrated their effects.

Monarchy had lost much in the Thirty Years' and succeeding wars, and was no longer able, as in the sixteenth century, to withstand an onset of the educated public. Great Britain was already an advanced constitutional monarchy governed by national representatives. And yet it was in one of the colonies of Great Britain that the people, in the cause of popular government, commenced successfully the career of revolution. In Prussia, at the court of Frederick II., had been set up the headquarters of a godless philosophy, derived from France, which was corrupting, by Gallicizing, the literature as well as the religion and moral force of Germany. France had recently seen the death of her greatest deistical writers, but their works were in the full tide of popularity, and their main force was directed against despotism and compulsory profession of faith—the oppressive bondage of life and conscience which still was carried to the last extreme in France.

The German empire at that juncture was governed by a wiser head and a kinder heart, but the broad and thorough reforms of the emperor Joseph II. were too far in advance of the time to be duly appreciated even by the people whose real interests they promoted, and his reign, followed by that of his brother, did not last long enough to give practical demonstration of their benefits.

Similar tendencies were manifesting themselves elsewhere, especially among the educated. The resistance of Rome proved ineffectual. Her arm was paralyzed, and her weapons fell short. She had been the close ally of an absolutism which in France could no longer be endured. Public opinion had reached a precipice. All existing authorities, ecclesiastical and civil, were coming under the charge of imposture. They had been united in extorting by deceit and violence the earnings of the industrial classes, until the nation groaned in utter inability to surrender more. To the religious, moral and political crisis was added, as really a fruit of the same causes in the government of France, a complete financial failure.

As a last resort to procure money a meeting of selected notables was called in 1788, by whom an assembly of the states-general was advised. That assembly, which met in May, 1789, was, in the main, representative of the mind of France. The force of opinion which had been forming for two or three generations soon appeared. The leading minds proved to be pupils of Rousseau, accepting the doctrines of the *Contrat Social*. Self-constituted, the national assembly (June 17, 1789) gave place (October 1, 1791) to the

legislative assembly, in the same spirit. Religion was abolished. Reason was enthroned and everything was rejected that militated against the popular theory. The movement became bolder as it proceeded. In less than four years the monarchy was overthrown; the king, first reduced to helplessness, then kept prisoner, was finally led to the scaffold. A republic was proclaimed. The churches were plundered; their silver plate was sent to the mint to be coined. Priests were to be found among the officers of the revolutionary government. Those who refused to submit or were suspected to be dangerous, if they failed to escape into exile, were put to death.

Another stage was reached; the doctrinaires and philosophers were outrun by the popular passions which they had aroused. The leaders of the mob grasped the power. Philosophers themselves became suspected. A reign of terror ensued. None could feel safe. It was impossible to see from day to day what new turn the movement might take. The archbishop of Paris abandoned his profession and joined the Revolution. The churches, from which gospel Christianity had been so long banished by its professed ministers, were given up to the wantonness of the mob and to mummeries under the name of reason. Instead of church festivals came days consecrated to genius, to labor, to perfection and to other abstractions.

A symptom of reaction appeared in a national festival in honor of the supreme Being, celebrated on the 8th of July, 1794, in which the terrorist leader Robespierre officiated as a priest. After five years of a gov-

ernment by reason people began to long for tranquillity, ready to accept the direction of any strong rule which could secure it. But consequences had been incurred which were not yet exhausted. Armies were employed to enforce freedom upon the nations. The directory which sent them out was soon overwhelmed by the most successful of their generals, who rapidly rose from one degree of power to another, until he had gathered all the reins of government into his own hands. France became the treasure-house of Napoleon Bonaparte, and her armies his weapons with which to scourge the nations and build up an empire to his own glory.

In the wars successively of the republic, the directory, the consulate and the empire, the penalty fell upon the whole of Europe. The political systems of Germany were dissolved as well as those of the Romanic states to the south. The constitutional forms of both the Romish and the Lutheran Church were shaken at the centre of their dominions. The heaviest blows fell where historical justice demanded—upon the head of the papacy and its champions, the houses of Bourbon and of Hapsburg; and, on the side of the unchristian rationalists, upon the court of Berlin and the revolutionists of France themselves. Prussia was for a time erased from the list of kingdoms; the old German empire was extinguished, its honors were removed to Paris, and only the title of Austria was left; the donation of Pepin and Charlemagne to the papacy was revoked; and the pope, who protested, was by order of Napoleon seized and consigned to prison.

In the early years of that revolution the enthusiasm

which fired the armies of France was that of the propaganda of reason—the thorough conviction that the world was living in falsehood and suffering for it, that the popular philosophy was right, and that its establishment over the world would abolish the worst evils of human life.

Against such a powerful motive the other Romish nations and the Protestants on the Continent were feeble, for the very reason that they entertained no doctrine adequate to resist it. The same way of thinking deeply leavened their own ranks. The soldiers of Germany and those of Italy fought in defence of their countries, it is true, but also of institutions in the justice of which many of them did not believe and the oppressiveness of which they hated. The French fought on the side of their cordial convictions, and firmly believed themselves the liberators of the world. When French armies lost that impulse in seeing an emperor appropriate all to himself, their victories began to lack in brilliancy; and when, still further, they came into conflict with a people who were never much impressed by their principles, and as a whole were as tenacious of the opposite, as in the case partly of England and entirely of Russia, the issue of war was reversed.

Never was anything in practice more truly logical than the French Revolution. The world beheld with horror its inhuman cruelties and desecration of holy things, but it was only the reduction to practice of doctrines which had been taught under sanction of the churches or which the churches had encountered with only denunciations and penalties. Systematic

suppression of gospel truth in the Romish connection had wrought effects kindred to those of a worldly-minded rationalism in the Protestant, and the popular philosophy had, to a great extent, undermined the foundations of Christian faith in both.

Like the English Commonwealth, the French Revolution ended in what seemed to be utter failure, and yet was not failure. The immediate purposes of the actors did not succeed, but changes were effected and principles were planted to germinate and bear good fruit in years to come.

The reign of rationalism was not all for evil. It swept away certain superstitions which the world is well rid of, and put an end to certain traditionary beliefs which had nothing but tradition to recommend them, and to practices which were a bondage to society. Governments were not all forthwith reconstructed as constitutional, but the working of ideas then established in the minds of men has ever since been in that direction. It would not be possible now to govern any European nation as France was governed in the reign of Louis XV., while the power of the Romish hierarchy was so broken that its former breadth and intensity of oppression have not since been united.

A NEW PHILOSOPHY.

While that practical revolution which had its centre in France was going on, another was passing over the philosophy and religious views of Germany. It was a better method of thought that the thinking world needed, and a new, if not a better, at that time arose.

Emmanuel Kant was born in 1724, at Königsberg,

in Prussia. He entered the university of that city in 1740, and as student, tutor and professor spent his life in connection with it. In 1770 he was elected to the ordinary professorship of logic and metaphysics, which he held until 1794, when he resigned owing to the infirmities of age. He died in 1804. His great work *The Critique of the Pure Reason* was published in 1781, his *Critique of the Practical Reason* in 1788, his *Critique of the Judgment* in 1790, and in 1793 his *Religion within the Bounds of the Pure Reason*. Other publications from his pen appeared within the same time and until 1798.

The philosophy of Kant was transcendental in relation to the popular philosophy of that day, using "transcendental" as applied to *a-priori* or necessary cognitions which transcend the sphere of the knowledge acquired by experience; but it was discriminately a critical philosophy, a criticism of the very foundations upon which its predecessor so confidently stood. Its criticism was of the mental faculties with a view to ascertain invariable and necessary principles, to define their usage, and to form an estimate of them "with reference to their formal character." Making the mind the centre of its system, it sought by means of self-knowledge to prepare the way for a better state of psychological science. But the forms of thought to which universality and necessity belong are subjective, and the work of Kant was merely a critical treatment of the phenomena of consciousness. It opened no avenue to a knowledge of objective being.

While the new philosophy was slowly making its

way among leading thinkers, and its progress for many years was very slow, the popular rationalists carried the application of their principles to the last extreme.

Kant was a Christian, but his practical faith had no root in his philosophy, in which the objective stands unknown and unknowable, and the inner consciousness is the only thing absolutely necessary and stable. His treatment of Christianity went to merge it in a moral system. God and the facts of revelation belonging to the objective, the human reason can never immediately know them. A great gulf was left between the cognizing subject and all outer things. Solution of that difficulty became the starting-point for several subsequent philosophies.

Fichte, a professor at Jena, and finally at Berlin, believed that he had found the solution in the intuition of the *ego*. Intelligent being he designated the *ego*, and all objective existence as the *non-ego*. By an act of faith the former grasps and absorbs the latter into itself. In the adoption of that principle the transcendental philosophy was essentially changed throughout. Thinking shaped everything else. God and the universe were what the mind conceived them to be. God, if any place was left for a supreme being, was the moral order of the universe—not existence, but action, the universal *ego* in its activity and without limit.

The Fichtean philosophy—or, as it was called, philosophy of faith or science of knowing—had a more immediate popularity than the critical, but left no such solid work behind it, except in the extraordinary quickening of intellectual activity which it occasioned. A

large class of literary men accepted its doctrines as opening a wider range to the imagination.

Among the followers of Fichte the greatest eminence was attained by Schelling and Hegel. The former while yet a youth startled the philosophical world by a theory of even greater boldness than that of his master. "To be," said this new philosophy, "is to know." It derived all knowledge, not from the partial principle of the *ego*, but from the absolute—the identity of subject and object, or of knowing and being. God is the absolute, which represents itself as divided into the spheres of mind and nature, just as in the magnet we perceive the difference of the positive and negative poles, and can realize himself only in the existence of the universe, and especially of human nature. This was the central point of the philosophy of identity. It presented the outlines which Hegel afterward described more firmly and filled up in his own way.

Hegel's system was variously called the philosophy of reason, of the absolute or of the ideal. It conceived of the absolute as the concrete unity of nature and mind. This unity Hegel called the idea. It is not only the absolute content of all thinking, but also the substance of all being. And the universe of the Hegelian philosophy is mapped out as three great constellations—the science of the idea in and for itself, the science of the idea representing itself externally, and the science of its return within itself as logic, natural philosophy and mental philosophy respectively. And the divisions and subdivisions of these are ramified out to a treatment of all known or conceivable

existence. Religion comes under the third head, and is defined as the true in the form of mental representation. Christianity, as the religion in which the unity of the divine and human is presented, contains the ultimate point of all truth. But the lower form alone of the idea is possessed in the several facts of Christian history and dogma.

It was under the hand of Hegel that the transcendental philosophy reached its completeness. After his death his followers divided into several sects, and that particular style of thinking gradually lost its power.

Hegel's work was done chiefly from 1817, when he commenced the journal for scientific criticism, until 1831, when he died. Schelling's philosophical career was commenced in his twenty-first year, when he was a student at Jena, and continued until 1812, when he was thirty-seven. From that date until 1841 he published nothing on philosophy. In 1841 he was appointed to the chair of philosophy in Berlin, but in power or attractiveness did not equal himself in his early days. If he gained less glory as a philosopher, he left the impression that he had become a truer Christian. He soon withdrew again to his retirement, and died at Ragatz, in Switzerland, August 20, 1854.

Followers of those great teachers and holders to their systems, though dissenting from some of their doctrines, have been numerous, and some of hardly inferior renown. Out of this new philosophy, and especially that of Hegel, arose the later style of rationalism—more profound, more imaginative, of vastly

wider range and abler grasp than its predecessor, but equally productive of error. Other elements have also entered into it from one side and another, going more or less to modify the philosophical. Pietism, Moravianism, strict Lutheranism or Calvinism not only continued to assert themselves separately, but have also had their share in shaping the speculative views of later rationalists.

In the division which followed the death of Hegel the pantheistic branch of his philosophy grafted itself on the University of Tübingen, which had formerly been Pietist, and there produced its fruit in the writings of Strauss, Zeller and Christian Baur, while others like Daub, Marheincke and Dorner took the opposite course toward a more scriptural doctrine. The extremes may be represented by Strauss, Bruno Baur and Feuerbach on the one hand, and Dorner on the other.

Of the transcendental philosophy in all its stages as now a thing of the past we may say that, after all its extravagances, its arbitrary speculations and cloudland theories, which have disappeared or are destined to disappear, it has accomplished some solid work. It has determined attention to important truths which the previous philosophy had overlooked—to the truth that nature is not a dead mechanism, but operated by a spiritual power between which and the soul of man there is a sympathy, mysterious, but real and active; that the past is not dead; that, although irretrievable, it can never die; that it belongs to the eternal organism of the universe; that the Church is not a mere incidental society, but an organic body actuated by a common spiritual life distinguishing it from the

world; that its doctrines are the laws or expressions of that life; and that worship is the solemn act of acknowledging the higher relations of the soul.

It constrained attention to the fact that there is in man a capacity to apprehend God and spiritual as well as material things—things above the reach of the senses—and a capacity whereby to accept a spiritual experience. A style of thinking was introduced in accordance with which the mysteries of faith and of the life in God could be spoken of without exposure to ridicule. Whatever mistakes the transcendentalists made—and some of their mistakes were stupendous—they did not overlook the supersensuous. Although they had no place for the supernatural, they opened so wide a world beyond that of common life that men could again speak freely of the realities unseen—of the dealings of God with the soul, of the union of God and man, and of a life which the outer senses never knew, having its roots, not in them, but in God. In short, although not Christian, it opened an intelligent world in which Christian discussion could move freely and spiritual life have recognition. Welded together with error fatal to itself, it proved an implement effective to the accomplishment of work much needed to be done in its time.

Another path out of the cold illuminism of the eighteenth century, as well as out of the mere subjectivism of the transcendentalists, was constituted in the writings of Jacobi, who, without constructing a system of his own, pointed out with a clear and lofty criticism the errors of others and wherein they might be amended.

Frederick Henry Jacobi (1743-1819) found the essential elements of Christianity in the belief in a personal God, in moral freedom and the eternity of human personality. "Conceived thus in its purity and based on the immediate witness of the personal consciousness, there is for him nothing greater than Christianity." He also held that, in addition to the outer senses, whereby we know the outer world, we are possessed of an inner sense by which we have direct knowledge of supernatural truth. The system of Spinoza he admired for its consistency, but rejected it as in "conflict with the imperative wants of the human spirit." He also opposed the pantheism of the transcendentalists, and recognized a personal God of whom we can think, not as *I*, but as *thou*, and to whom we can pray as God at once above us and communicating himself to us.

A NEW REVIVAL AMONG THE LUTHERAN CLERGY.

But the radical revolution in German theology was the work of Schleiermacher, who, although a rationalist, advanced a principle which undermined the omnipotence of human reason.

Frederick Ernst Daniel Schleiermacher was the son of a Reformed clergyman and born at Breslau in 1768. His education he received in the schools of the Moravian Brethren, and afterward in the University of Halle. From 1796 to 1802 he was preacher for the hospital in Berlin, from 1804 to 1806 professor at Halle, from 1809 minister of a church in Berlin, and from 1810 until his death professor of theology in the university there. He died in 1834.

The corner-stone of Schleiermacher's theological teaching was the doctrine of a religious feeling. He addressed rationalists on their own principles, and yet defended religion as occupying a position which their weapons could not reach. They had begun to reject religion because it did not conform to the measurements of reason; he urged that such was the case because religion belonged to a power of the human mind which their philosophy had overlooked. Although influenced by the pantheism of Spinoza, he distinguished between God and the universe, and differed from the transcendentalists in teaching that the mental act of apprehension depends upon the action of our senses, through which not merely ideas of things, but "their being, is taken up into our consciousness." The universe is the totality of all existing things. The unity of it is deity. It is united in all parts by a reciprocity of influences, and accordingly every part is both active and passive. "With human activity is connected the feeling of freedom, and with passibility that of dependence. Toward the infinite as the unity of the universe man has a feeling of absolute dependence; in this feeling religion has its root. Religious ideas and dogmas are forms of the manifestation of the religious feeling, and as such are specifically distinguished from scientific speculation, which aims to reproduce in subjective consciousness the world of objective reality." He insisted, accordingly, upon the supremacy of the religious feeling in all questions of theology.

In the early part of the present century the theologians of Germany were still divided in such a way

that they might approximately be classed as rationalists, supernaturalists and mediates. Among leaders of the first were Paulus of Heidelberg, Gesenius of Halle, Bähr of Weimar and Bretschneider of Gotha; of the second were Reinhardt of Wittenberg and Knapp of Halle; while De Wette of Basil might be named as representing the third. But high above all those distinctions rose the work of Schleiermacher, creating in itself an epoch in German theology. With him co-operated Neander, professor of Church history in Berlin, from 1812 to his death, in 1850, in a more close Pietist spirit, but with a wider influence, from the vast popularity of his lectures and writings.

Schleiermacher's theology of feeling, expressed by Neander as theology of the heart, was a clear step out of the old vulgar rationalism and into a philosophical position different from that of the transcendentalists, and so lofty and comprehensive that it enlisted the zealous attention of the best class of thinkers among the young, some of whom were to arrive at a more positive evangelical faith than was ever reached by their teacher.

THE CHURCH OF PRUSSIA.

Another important element in the Church history of Germany arose in the court of Berlin. Two favorite enterprises of Frederick III. were the establishment of a university on a greatly enlarged scale and the union of Lutheran and Reformed Churches within his dominions. The University of Berlin went into operation in 1810. To unite the two Churches occasioned more controversy, and was effected only

after the efforts of many years. Occasion was taken of the tercentenary birthday of the Reformation to promote it, but a stand was also then taken by Harms, archdeacon of Kiel, in favor of close Lutheranism in his ninety-five theses in imitation of Luther.

It was not the king's purpose to constrain either side to surrender their proper doctrine, but to comprehend both within one organization, and requiring of them to worship together and to use the same service prepared for them, in common, under the king's supervision and with his aid. At first the service failed to give satisfaction. Years of controversy ensued, in the end of which the presbyterial constitution, modified by the consistorial, with a General Assembly, was adopted. A royal order of June 29, 1850, followed by another of September, 1873, constituted it definitely the government of the United Church of Prussia. The Lutherans retain their Augsburg Confession and other symbols, and the Reformed the Heidelberg Catechism. The king is head of the Church, but his laws enacted in that capacity require the assent of the General Synod.

Rationalism still prevails among the educated in Germany, but evangelical doctrine has gained ground of late years. The school of thought which commenced with Schleiermacher has led the way into a more simple and scriptural faith, and includes some of the greatest theologians now living or who have recently died.

The Christian public of Germany, which, under the conflicting speculations of their teachers, had long been indifferent to the whole subject of religion,

toward the end of the first quarter of the present century gave signs of an internal movement of a more vital Christianity. It was connected with the awakening of a real interest in the salvation of the heathen, which had gradually extended to the Lutheran Church from Anglican and Moravian sources. That spirit had existed in Denmark before, but was now for the first time enjoyed by the Lutherans of Germany. The revival appeared at first in a very humble way in the form of little prayer-meetings, obscure and thinly attended, but conducted by men of such earnest piety as John Gosner and the baron von Kottwitz, who is said to have been the principal agent in the conversion of Tholuck. Their work gradually vindicated for itself a wider field and gave such fruits as are to be found in their foreign missions, and, most striking of all, the recent inner missions now planted extensively over Germany and addressing themselves to millions who otherwise worship nowhere. Meanwhile, the universities of Halle, of Königsberg, of Tübingen, and others, have partaken in a revival of scriptural doctrine.

CHAPTER XVII.

REVIVAL AMONG THE REFORMED CHURCHES ON THE CONTINENT OF EUROPE.

CHURCH OF GENEVA.

TOWARD the end of the eighteenth century the influence of Moravian doctrine and life began to penetrate the coldness of Genevan rationalism. It was evinced in the preaching and writings of the pastor Jacob Francillon. He was followed by the elder Cellerier, Peschier, Moulinié, Edward Diodati, and one or two others. The preaching in the Church, upon the whole, continued to be the bald naturalism of the preceding half century. Among the congregations a number were dissatisfied, but the movement of revival was still timid and halting and in the hands of but a few. At that stage it was providentially furnished with an instructor whose theology was neither halting nor timid.

After the close of the Napoleonic wars, when the more serious impediments to travel were removed, Robert Haldane left Scotland on a tour of religious instruction. After visiting Paris and Montauban, he arrived at Geneva in the beginning of 1817. His sole object being to promote the study of Scripture truth, he began by conversing with any whom he found disposed to consider the subject. Among the theological students no less than twenty in the course of a short

time sought his conversation. He appointed certain hours in the week for them to come to his room, when he gave regular lectures on the Epistle to the Romans, expounding to them its doctrine of salvation through faith in a Redeemer. Most of them in a few years became the instruments of God in an earnest revival of religion in the Church of Geneva which extended itself to the Reformed churches far abroad. Among them were Frederick Monod, Merle d'Aubigné and S. L. Gaussen. Mr. Malan, already a pastor, attended Mr. Haldane privately.

After Mr. Haldane left Geneva the work was continued by those whom he had instructed, with some assistance from abroad. Constrained to leave the Established Church, they, with the church-members who joined them, formed a new Church organization as the Evangelical Free Church of Geneva, with their own school and theological seminary. In the latter the first professors were Gaussen, Galland and Merle d'Aubigné. Since that revival Geneva has once more become a centre of evangelical influences to the continent of Europe.

A similar evangelical influence is operating in the other Protestant cantons of Switzerland. Yet there is also a rationalist party which presents itself as an opposition. Upon the whole, the greater number of the population are Protestant, but in eleven of the twenty-two cantons the Catholics are the majority.

REFORMED CHURCH OF FRANCE.

In the French Revolution, Protestantism, like Roman Catholicism, was equally free and despised by

those at the head of the government. Protestants were liberated from oppression, but enjoyed no recognition. In 1802, Napoleon, then first consul, granted them lawful toleration in worship and a code of discipline founded on their own acts of synod, but with the condition that he should have jurisdiction over them in all things. He also in 1809 reopened their theological seminary at Montauban, which had been suppressed in 1661. Their residence was still chiefly in the land where once the Huguenots were most numerous.

The restoration, in 1814, guaranteed to Roman Catholicism the authority of the Established religion, and to the other Confessions toleration and protection. But no sooner was the old party restored to power than persecution of Protestants was renewed, especially in the South, and eminently in the department of Gard, where it is not likely ever to be forgotten. At the remonstrance of England and Prussia the process of plunder, oppression and murder was stopped, but the perpetrators went unpunished. Since then the Protestants of France have suffered many restrictions, but finally, under the present government, have recovered the ordinary privileges of French subjects.

After the Revolution of 1848 the Reformed Church, in a council held at Paris, divided on the question of disregarding creeds in the matter of their organization. Frederick Monod and Count Gasparin, in defence of their doctrinal standards, protested against the laxity of the majority and withdrew. Thirty congregations went with them and formed a new organization, known as "the Union of Evangelical Churches in France."

In 1809, when the faculty at Montauban was constituted, there were not one hundred and fifty Protestant preachers in all the land. Now those of the National Reformed Church alone are more than seven hundred; and if those of the Union and of the French Lutheran are added, the number rises to over eight hundred and seventy. Yet nearly sixty places are vacant. The Reformed Church has also restored its own proper government and organized within its membership numerous societies for systematic Christian work.

THE CHURCH OF HOLLAND.

With the fall of the republic of the United Netherlands before the advance of French arms also fell the constitution of the Church. In 1806 a kingdom of Holland was formed, with Louis Bonaparte as king. It did not last long, and four years later was incorporated with the French empire. When, in 1814, the Netherlands were liberated from that yoke, it was found that everything of Church organization had perished except the classes. The State assumed the regulation of the Church. In 1816 a general government of the Reformed Church was established, in which the congregations, classes and provincial synods regained a large part of their former rights, and a National Synod was constituted the head of the whole.

So deeply had rationalism entered into the teaching of the Church that when the attempt was made to return to the standard of orthodoxy it met with great, and in some respects invincible, opposition. The spirit of revival, however, made progress, and, although it

failed to carry a majority in the Church, by the year 1832 it became strong enough to constitute an important evangelical power. Among the leaders in it stood the poet Bilderdijk and his pupils Da Costa and Capadose, with the statesman Van Prinsterer. In 1839 a portion of that party obtained the royal permission to form separate congregations. This dissenting Church of the Netherlands stands on the foundation of the theology of Dort, and seeks after an earnest practical religion.

Under Austrian rule the reforms of Joseph II. and Leopold II. failed of effecting all that was intended. Francis I., who succeeded, indulged aggressions upon Protestant rights, and, being involved in wars with France, could give little attention to the grievances of his subjects. After those wars had closed, in 1817, a deputation from both Lutheran and Reformed churches of Hungary waited upon him. They received fair promises, but little was done. Again they applied in 1822, and again were put off with promises; Francis died, in 1835, without having fulfilled them. Prince Metternich still continued at the head of authority. A royal resolution appeared in 1844 declaring that all the different Confessions should have equal rights and privileges. And yet the Hungarian insurrection, which took place soon afterward, was provoked by an edict of General Haynau threatening the extinction of the Protestant churches of Hungary. The insurrection became a war, which issued in the defeat of the Hungarians and in expatriation of their leaders, at the head of whom was Louis Kossuth.

More recently the growing strength of the Prot-

estant communities and the increase of liberal sentiment in Europe enable them to take a more independent and energetic stand, and the Austrian government has been constrained to pay more respect to their wishes. To the same effect was the Prussian war of 1866, by which Austria was expelled from Western Germany, and it became expedient for her to propitiate all classes of her eastern subjects. The loss, also, of all the Italian states now confines the Austrian empire to the north of the Alps, and the lands of the Hungarian crown constitute too large a proportion of the whole to be risked for the interest of an ecclesiastical chief in a foreign land who has lost all power to enforce his authority in temporal things.

Surrounded by Roman Catholics, Greek Catholics, Jews and Turks, the Reformed and Lutheran churches in the Austrian dominions have felt the necessity of mutual support and co-operation. "Their General Synods meet simultaneously and at the same place, and deliberate on all subjects not strictly denominational in joint session." By the census returns of 1870 they amounted to ten per cent. of the whole population of the empire. As their symbolical books, the Reformed retain the Second Helvetic Confession and the Heidelberg Catechism, while the Lutheran adhere to the Augsburg Confession. In their constitution and administration they agree. Each is composed of four superintendencies, or synodical authorities, and each superintendency contains several seniorates, or presbyteries; each seniorate, a number of congregations; and each congregation is governed by its own pastor and presidents.

CHAPTER XVIII.

LATER ROMANISM.

THE PAPACY.

By the campaign of 1796, Italy fell into the hands of France. Rome was occupied by French troops and the papal government overthrown in 1798. Pius VI., carried captive into France, died the next year. After an interval of more than six months a successor was elected at Venice, who took the name "Pius VII." Napoleon, when first consul, determined to re-establish the Roman Catholic Church, and entered into a concordat with the pope, restoring him to a limited ecclesiastical authority. He also obtained the sanction of the pope to his assumption of imperial rank. Pius VII. returned to Rome, but was afterward, for non-compliance with Napoleon's European policy, seized by French troops and detained in custody, first in Savoy, and afterward at Fontainebleau, retaining the titles of his office, but without any real jurisdiction over his estates. Upon the fall of Napoleon, in 1814, he was restored to Rome, which he entered on the 21st of March.

With that date the papacy commenced a new stage of existence. All parties who had suffered from French aggression had a common sympathy with

one another, in which the pope had a large share. Upon such a tide of sentiment Romanism rose to a position higher than it had occupied in general esteem for half a century. One of the first acts of the re-established pope was to take measures for the revival of the Jesuit order, which was effected on the 7th of August next. Then followed the Inquisition and other apparatus and adjuncts of the papal government. Resistance was made in both Spain and Italy, but was suppressed by military force. Pius VII. proved a bitter enemy of all that was called "improvement." His estates were put under the government of ecclesiastics; laymen were to be trusted as little as possible, and the greatest caution exercised in allowing any of them to have access to the Scriptures. Pius VII. died in August, 1823. Under the next pope, Leo XII., reaction proceeded with increasing zeal. In the Protestant states privileges were granted to Roman Catholics which had long been denied. In 1829 those in the British isles were relieved of the last civil disabilities which the conflicts of bygone ages had laid upon them.

In that year Leo XII. died, and his successor, Pius VIII., survived him only a few months. Gregory XVI., elected in 1830, occupied the papal throne sixteen years. In the course of that time it was felt that the reaction had been urged too far, and that the current of popular sentiment could not endure what the extreme papal party were still disposed to press. Consequently, upon the death of Gregory, the cardinals made a concession to the more liberal spirit of the age in electing one who had some reputation for

sympathy with it—Cardinal John Mary Mastai Ferretti, who took the name “Pius IX.”

A few unimportant improvements made in the beginning of his pontificate gave the impression that Pius IX. was about to reform the papacy. His progress in that direction stopped short of public expectation. Rome became dissatisfied. In the war then waged between Sardinia and Austria, Rome sympathized with the former; the pope, with the latter. Insurrection was fomented. The papal prime minister, De Rossi, was slain, and Pius IX. himself fled in disguise to Mola de Gaeta, within the protection of Naples.

Meanwhile, the French Revolution of 1848 had been effected, and the prince-president, to secure Catholic votes in France, sent troops to reduce the republic which the Romans had set up and to restore the pope. Pius IX. was from that day kept on his throne, against the will of the people of Rome, by the help of bayonets. When those of Napoleon III. were withdrawn, those of Victor Emmanuel had to render the necessary service.

Under the reign of Pius IX. the most noteworthy ecclesiastical facts were the absolute dependence of the pope upon foreign protection against the dissatisfaction of his own subjects; the restoration of the Roman hierarchy in England, and its extension into the United States; the establishment of religious toleration in Italy; the promulgation of the dogma declaring the Virgin Mary to have been born without taint of original sin; the Vatican council, and its resolution rendering it binding upon every Roman Catholic to believe that the pope is infallible when, “in discharge of his office

as pastor and teacher of all Christians," "he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the universal Church." Immediately after the passing of that act of infallibility the French invaded Prussia, the French troops had to be withdrawn from Rome, the temporal power of the pope fell, and the protection of his person and ecclesiastical office was assumed by the king of Italy, in accordance with an overwhelming vote of the papal subjects (1870). Pius IX. died February 7, 1878, and was succeeded in office by Leo XIII.

ANTI-PAPALISM.

The infallibility dogma has given rise to a dissent, not of much weight in numbers nor in ecclesiastical rank, but taking its stand upon ground which the whole Catholic communion will in course of time be constrained to take. Its own just freedom and the loyalty of its members to the civil governments under which they live would seem now to demand that the Roman Catholic Church should abandon the papacy. That office long ago ceased to be a benefit to the community over which it rules, and now utterly misrepresents the attitude of loyal Catholics toward their respective countries.

In opposition to the extreme papalism of the Vatican council, a party under the leadership of Professor Döllinger of Munich, and calling themselves "Old Catholics," has been organized on the ground of rejecting the infallibility of the pope.

In 1848 freedom of religion began to be adopted in the kingdom of Sardinia—a freedom which has sustained itself by evincing its benefits. It is now ex-

tended to all Italy and Sicily, and has entered even the walls of Rome. A similar progress has been vindicated in South-western Germany, France and Austria, but still encounters much opposition in Spain. The apparent growth of papalism in England and the United States is delusive. Those who put confidence in its present appearances will, in case of any practical test occurring, find themselves deceived. The support of papalism now is the Jesuit order.

THE PAPAL GOVERNMENT.

1. The present pope, Leo XIII.
2. The college of cardinals, when full, consists of six cardinal-bishops, fifty cardinal-priests and fourteen cardinal-deacons.
3. Next to the college of cardinals stand the *congregations*, or committees of different departments of government.
4. Subordinate to the government at Rome are the metropolitans, or archbishops, presiding over provinces of the ecclesiastical empire; and,
5. Under them, the bishops of dioceses, who in turn rule over all the priests and inferior secular clergy of their respective districts.
6. Another ramification of ecclesiasticism is that of the monastic system, the so-called regular clergy, in their various orders and under their respective generals and other officers. A great branch of the monastic system is constituted of such establishments for women, each nunnery being conducted by its abbess, or superior, subject to the general government of the Church.

CHAPTER XIX.

BRITISH CHURCHES SINCE 1688.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

AT the revolution in 1688, by which James was driven from the throne, eight English bishops, with Sancroft, archbishop of Canterbury, at their head, and about four hundred other clergy, who held to the divine right of kings, could not allow that the nation had any right to transfer the crown to another. They refused the oath of allegiance to the new king. Although they could not remain in the Establishment on that condition, they were tolerated in the exercise of their clerical functions as dissenters among those who preferred their ministrations. The small body which in Scotland adhered to Episcopacy took the same political ground. Under the name of "Non-Jurors" the sect continued to exist until after the hopeless defeat of the Jacobites, about the middle of the eighteenth century. The death of Charles Edward, in 1788, removed the last foothold on which the faction stood.

Fruits of the restoration of the Stuarts remained in the Established Church at the Revolution in parochial clergy, ill-educated, worldly-minded and intolerant, who opposed every step of improvement. With numerous exceptions, the higher clergy were com-

mendably disposed to reform abuses and to bring the national Church into harmony with the general Protestant convictions of England. With that view a royal commission revised the Liturgy. But their labor was rendered fruitless by the opposition of the lower House of Convocation.

At that date, and for more than a generation later, piety was at a very low ebb in the Anglican Church, which was largely actuated by political partyism. Those who defended the utmost claims of the prelacy, and confined all religion to the channel of prescribed routine, were called the "High Church," and sympathized, in the main, with the Tory party in the state. Those who attached greater weight to personal piety and less to mere ordinances went under the name of "Low Church," and corresponded to the Whig party in politics. Later in the century those names acquired a more purely religious meaning from the effects of the great revival.

DEISTIC CONTROVERSY

Such a state of the ministry was the proper soil for skepticism to grow in. The particular form it assumed was deism, which in the foregoing century had sprung up as a style of religious thought. Its progress, checked by the Christian zeal of the Commonwealth and the utter profligacy of the Restoration, quickened into a new activity under the decent but hollow profession which followed the Revolution. The early part and middle of the eighteenth century constituted in England its flourishing period. Its history consists of successive stages of controversy.

1. First it appeared, in the hands of Lord Herbert of Cherbury, as a heresy growing out of the biblical discussions of the first quarter of the seventeenth century and in a reverential spirit.

2. The reverential spirit disappeared in Hobbes and his successors. The earliest deists made their attack upon the substance of Scripture, and their opponents, Baxter, Locke, Whitby, Halyburton and others, labored to show the reasonableness of the Christian religion and that it is necessary to man's happiness. They were also led to define the principles of natural religion.

3. As the controversy advanced it turned into discussion of the canon and historical truth of certain passages of Scripture history.

4. After the first quarter of the eighteenth century the main stream of controversy followed the channel of testimony, and expended itself in criticism of the witnesses to the facts of Scripture separately.

5. After the death of David Hume no further reinforcement was made to the strength of the attack, while it lost in moral dignity.

With the progress of the controversy Christian apologists increased in number and zeal. Toward the middle of the century, not content with replying to attack, they began to construct works of permanent and independent value. Butler's *Analogy of Natural and Revealed Religion* was published in 1736. Farther on began to appear such works of independent criticism as West's treatise on *The Resurrection of Christ* (1747), Littleton's *Conversion and Apostleship of Paul*, and Newton *On Prophecy*. Toward the close of the century Paley published his view of the whole subject of

- the Christian evidences, and a few years later his treatise on *Natural Theology*.

The defence resulted in the production—

1. Of works on the necessity of revelation to the spiritual well-being of man.
2. Of scattered defences of the external evidences at particular points of attack.
3. Independent treatment of single events in Scripture history, gradually, as the series advanced, taking a wider range, and ultimately rising to the height and breadth of the whole field of the external evidences of Christianity.
4. Treatises on the internal evidences—first, internal as respects Scripture; and second, internal as respects the Christian's experience and character.
5. The radical starting-points of a new and better philosophy or style of thinking among Christians which recognized the separate existence of an inner experience of spiritual life.
6. As the deists made their attack from the side of natural theology, so Christian apologists were led to define the field and doctrines of natural theology and trace the analogy between it and the revealed. And the end was
7. The fourfold result of a complete system of Christian evidences, a complete treatment of natural theology, a masterly summing up of the great points of its analogy with the revealed, and an introduction to the defence of Christianity on its inner merits.

THE GREAT REVIVAL.

A general reform of morals appeared first in the serial essays published by Sir Richard Steele, Addison

and others in the *Tatler* (1709-10), *Spectator* (1710-13), *Guardian* (1713), and their successors. For an exposure of social follies and the example of a popular literature free from all stain of moral impurity the England of that day owed those writers an inestimable debt. The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge was instituted in 1698, and that for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts in 1701.

But the most powerful effect in reviving an interest in religion proceeded from a little society of students in the University of Oxford, of which John and Charles Wesley were the principal movers. It was formed about 1729, and for six or seven years continued to be merely a college society. In 1735 it was joined by George Whitefield. Much benefit was received from connection with the Moravian societies in London and elsewhere. In 1735 the Wesleys visited America, but not until 1738 did the society disperse over the British isles and to America preaching the gospel. In that year Whitefield made his first visit to America. In his work as an evangelist he traveled over the British isles, awakening everywhere an intense interest in religion. He visited America seven times, giving his aid to the revival then going forward in the colonies, and died at Newburyport, Massachusetts, September 30, 1770.

John Wesley, although an evangelist, marked his career especially by organizing societies for religious improvement, but retaining them all in connection with the Established Church of England. Before his death, in 1791, societies were formed in most places of importance in England, and some in Ireland and

the United States. Four years later they adopted measures constituting themselves a separate Church. Their brethren in America had assumed that attitude in 1784. The latter formed the Methodist Episcopal Church; the former, the Wesleyan Methodist. Both were characterized by an Arminian theology.

The Calvinistic Methodists, of whom Whitefield was the leader, failed to organize a complete association of their congregations. Most nearly approaching to it was that formed by the zeal and eminent business ability of Lady Huntington and that of the Welsh Calvinistic Methodists. Lady Huntington's connection proved of most benefit as promoting evangelical religion among the clergy and members of the Established Church. Within more recent times the great Methodist bodies have been broken by various divisions.

Although rejected by the Anglican Church, the revival was not without an extensive collateral influence upon many of both its clergy and its membership. Such persons were classed with the Low Church, but in course of time it was found necessary further to distinguish them as "Evangelical."

UNITARIANS.

About the same time with the rise of Methodism another divergence from the English Church took place in another direction. Socinians were few in England in the early part of the eighteenth century, but from the middle to the end of it their numbers increased, and their doctrines were advocated by writers of considerable ability. Before the century closed

Socinian places of worship were opened, and a sect was formed under the title of "Unitarian." Their principal advocate was Dr. Priestly, who in 1794 removed to the United States and took up his residence at Northumberland, in Pennsylvania, where he died in 1804.

RECENT CHURCH PARTIES.

Since the opening of the present century the English Church, notwithstanding her internal dissensions, has greatly extended her evangelical enterprise both at home and in missions among the colonies, and various societies have been organized both by her members and in co-operation with dissenters for the wider publication of scriptural knowledge.

In the progress of liberal opinions about 1832 and 1833 many Anglicans became alarmed for the safety of the Establishment. A few members of the University of Oxford, with a view to counteract the existing tendency of the public mind, undertook a series of publications called *Tracts for the Times*, which continued to appear from 1833 until 1841, to the number of ninety. Deep division of opinion was created by them, especially by the Romish tendency they evinced. In Number Ninety that tendency was so undisguised that the further publication of the series was forbidden. Mr. Newman, the author of that tract, with some of his colleagues in the enterprise, went over to Romanism. Professor Pusey was silenced, but at the end of two years was restored to his place in the university.

In the same general direction another party has arisen, seeking to engraft upon the Prayer-Book as

many of the rites and ceremonies of the Roman Catholic Church as suits their fancy.

Since the death of Dr. Arnold of Rugby, to whom they look with special reverence, another section has grown up, distinguished as the "Broad Church." Their aim is to permit broad comprehension of diverse views within the Establishment, with a liberal bearing toward Christians of other denominations.

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN SCOTLAND SINCE THE REVOLUTION OF 1688.

The General Assembly of the Established Church of Scotland as constituted at the Revolution consisted of three elements: first, the old ministers who had been ejected by the intrusion of prelacy, now numbering only sixty; second, the ministers of the Cameronian party, only three in number; and third, those who had unwillingly submitted to prelacy, much more numerous than the other two. The acts of Parliament upon which the Church was restored were those of the year 1592, constituting it, in its full Presbyterian character, the Established Church. The Covenant of 1638 was not renewed. Offence was thereby given to some of the Cameronians, who refused to go into the Establishment on that condition. They subsequently obtained a minister, a Mr. M'Millan, and took the name of "Reformed Presbyterians."

For the first twenty-five years after the Revolution the Church of Scotland, notwithstanding some incongruous elements, presented a noble example of zeal and consistent effort in her spiritual work. But in course of time rationalism, active elsewhere in that

century, invaded her bounds and led to division and secession.

In 1707 the kingdoms of England and Scotland were united. As preliminary thereto an act of Parliament had been passed—called the “Security Act”—guarding against any infringement of the rights of the Church of Scotland by that political change.

In 1712 an act of Parliament granted legal toleration to Episcopal dissenters in Scotland who wished to use the English Liturgy, and released them from the jurisdiction of the Church of Scotland. In the same Parliament an act was passed restoring patronage in Scottish parishes—a false step which subsequently led to many troubles.

The first secession arose out of the defence of orthodoxy from the increasing rationalism of the General Assembly. In 1732, Ebenezer Erskine was censured for preaching in opposition to certain prevailing errors. Against that act he protested, and was joined by three other ministers. Having been deposed, they threw themselves upon the support of those who agreed with them in their congregations, and thereby created the first Associate Presbytery. The second secession, in 1761, grew out of difficulties connected with patronage, and took the name of “the Relief Presbytery.” These secessions were not heresies, but made in defence of orthodoxy and for relief from secular interference. They proved of great benefit to the Presbyterian cause.

In its lowest period of rationalism the Church of Scotland was never without some evangelical laborers, although overwhelmed by a majority, who called them-

selves "moderates." Dr. Thomas Hardy and Dr. John Erskine in the latter part of the eighteenth century contended with great opposition, but made the beginning of what afterward became a revival of spiritual religion among the ministers. It appeared first in an attempt to interest the General Assembly in sending the gospel to the heathen—unsuccessful, but awakening inquiry and discussion. The small evangelical party increased in number. Toward the close of the French war it received valuable accessions in Dr. Andrew Thomson, who began his career of eminent usefulness at Edinburgh in 1810; in the publications of a dissenting minister, Dr. M'Crie, which began with his *Life of Knox* in 1811; and in the removal of Thomas Chalmers from a little country charge to the city of Glasgow in 1815; and also in the work of Andrew Symington as preacher and professor of theology in the Reformed Presbyterian church at Paisley. The various agencies of pastoral duty, as well as of preaching and of home and foreign missions, were quickened to more active life. Eight years later the same zeal in Christian work was carried to the University of St. Andrews by the election of Dr. Chalmers to the professorship of philosophy.

In 1824, Dr. Inglis, leader of the moderate party, brought the subject of foreign missions before the Assembly. A committee was appointed (1825) to consider the matter. A favorable report was accepted, and measures were taken accordingly; and in 1829, Alexander Duff, first missionary of the Established Church of Scotland, went to India.

As the revival progressed among the ministers and

congregations the burdens and obstructions of patronage were felt to be oppressive, and in many cases injurious to spiritual life. Its abuses in some quarters were complained of before the Assembly, which took steps to protect the people against the process of imposing ministers upon them by force. This led to a conflict with the civil courts, which sustained the patrons. The matter was carried to Parliament, but nothing was done for relief of the difficulty. In this conflict of authorities the civil power very easily remained the victor. As long as the Church received her pay through the hands of the State, it was resolved that she should submit to the conditions imposed by the State.

After an earnest and patient struggle of about ten years a large number of the ministers agreed to submit. Others felt that such a submission would put them in worse condition than before, and preferred the alternative of surrendering the emoluments of the Establishment. Accordingly, in 1843, they left it, to the number of four hundred and seventy-four ministers and a corresponding number of the laity. By the previous efforts and large organizing power of Chalmers and others the ground had been well prepared for them; their government and maintenance were provided for, and they forthwith took their position as the Free Church of Scotland. This has proved an active evangelical Church, almost rivaling the Establishment in numbers, while the Establishment has greatly increased in evangelical spirit. Freedom from patronage has also been obtained by the act of Parliament of 1874.

There were thus four Presbyterian Churches in Scotland—the Established Church, the Free Church, the Reformed Presbyterian, and the United Presbyterian, consisting of the Associate and Relief churches combined. All four had their branches in the colonies and in the United States, and missions among the heathen. In 1876 the Reformed Presbyterians united with the Free Church.

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN IRELAND AFTER THE REVOLUTION.

King William landed at Carrickfergus on the 14th of June, and the battle of the Boyne was fought on the 1st of July, 1690. James, hopelessly defeated, hurried from the country, never to return. King William recognized the loyalty of the Presbyterians by issuing an order to the collector of customs at Belfast for the regular payment of twelve hundred pounds annually to the Presbyterian ministers of Ulster, the beginning of the *regium donum*, or royal bounty, which, enlarged from time to time, was continued until 1870.

By the new oath of allegiance Presbyterians were put under no civil disabilities, but the attempt to obtain from the Irish Parliament toleration for their religion failed. In 1704 a civil disability was gratuitously created in the sacramental test, whereby "all persons holding any office, civil or military, or receiving any pay or salary from the Crown," were to take the sacrament in the Established Church within three months after any such appointment—an offence which was not repealed until after the lapse of seventy-five years.

Though encountering many obstacles, the Presbyterian Church in Ulster continued to increase in numbers. In 1742 a congregation connected with the Associate Synod of Scotland was planted in that province, and a few years later one of Reformed Presbyterians, both of whom sustained the cause of orthodoxy when it was declining in the Synod of Ulster.

From 1770 the supporters of the Westminster Confession were the minority in that synod, and the years intervening until 1793 showed a great progress in error among the ministers, although the teaching of the Shorter Catechism was never abandoned by the Presbyterian families.

In the last decade of the eighteenth century the new spirit of missions began to awaken interest, and in 1798 an evangelical association was formed in Ulster for home-mission enterprise, consisting of members from the Associate Church, the Synod of Ulster and from the Establishment. Kindred efforts succeeded—improvement of ministerial education, common education, supplying Bibles on easy terms to the poor, which led to the formation of a branch Bible society—and by the year 1808 the change amounted to a real ministerial revival of sound doctrine.

The corresponding movement in Scotland made itself felt in Ulster, and vacant congregations began to be supplied by young evangelical ministers where Unitarians had preceded them. One of those young men, Henry Cook, became a most active and efficient leader in the revival. At the synod of 1828 a vote on all points of the Unitarian controversy gave a large majority for the orthodox. Next year the Unitarians

withdrew and formed what is called "the Remonstrant Synod of Ulster." This step prepared the way for union of the Ulster and Associate Synods, which was effected on the 10th of July, 1840, constituting thereby the "General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland." At the same time missionaries were set apart for India. At the disruption of the Church of Scotland, in 1843, the sympathies of the Irish Presbyterians went with the Free Church.

The disestablishment of the Episcopal Church in Ireland "necessarily led to the abolition of state grants to any religious body." Accordingly, since 1870 the *regium donum* has been withheld. All denominations in Ireland are now on the same civil footing.

CHAPTER XX.

THE AMERICAN CHURCHES.

PLANTING.

THE Peace of Westphalia asserted religious freedom for states, but did not venture to liberate the individual conscience. Notwithstanding the good and great men among them, it was difficult for nations having their home by the Mediterranean Sea to emancipate themselves from opinions and authorities incorporated with their history, and enforced, if not to some degree created, by their geographical relations. The limits of thought were greatly extended when Commerce betook herself to the ocean. Upon the new continent of North America, for the first time, was Protestant principle consistently carried into practice, and that by no means all at once, but through many experiences which could not have been made elsewhere. The southern continent of the West, Central America, Mexico, California and the West India islands were claimed by Spain and Portugal, and on all the territory of their occupation the faith of Rome was planted, and in some places enforced with the utmost severity. The eastern coast of the northern continent, from the thirtieth to the forty-fourth degrees of latitude, was set apart for the observance of the gospel in its freedom.

It was during the oppressive dominion of the Stuart dynasty in England, and, as respects the continent of Europe, from the formation of the two antagonist leagues which led to the Thirty Years' war, until the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes that the earliest and most important Protestant settlements were made. Though numerous and somewhat heterogeneous in character, a certain spontaneous order operated in their occurrence which presents the basis of a classification. The history is that of five different groups of colonies. Virginia, New York and Massachusetts were the earliest, planted in 1607, 1613 and 1620 respectively—the first by Episcopalians, the second by Dutch Reformed, and the third by Congregationalists. A fourth commenced in a British settlement at Port Royal, South Carolina, in 1670, from which proceeded the founders of Charleston in 1680. The fifth group was that of the Quaker settlements in Pennsylvania and adjoining parts of New Jersey, constituted by William Penn in 1682.

From each original settlement proceeded secondary colonies, chiefly westward and southward, but also to the north, and new immigrations swelled their numbers. Massachusetts enlarged her territory westward; to the north, New Hampshire and Maine began their history soon after their leader; Vermont, a hundred years later; and on the south grew up Rhode Island and Connecticut. In all those, except Rhode Island, the Puritan faith of the Pilgrims prevailed.

Of the lands lying between Connecticut and the head of the Chesapeake Bay, the northern occupants were Presbyterians from Holland, the southern were

Lutheran Danes and Swedes. In 1655 the Dutch reduced the Lutherans, and in 1664 the English conquered the Dutch, thereby uniting their northern group of colonies with the southern.

From the original settlements in Virginia an offset to the north, leading to the formation of Maryland, was made on Kent island by Captain William Clayborne and his party in 1631. Three years afterward the colony of Lord Baltimore arrived, with a royal charter covering all the territory, styled in it *Terra Mariæ*—"Mary's land"—in honor of the queen Henrietta Maria. Clayborne was called upon to acknowledge himself a subject of the newcomer. He refused, and was, together with most of his people, driven out. In 1642 a company of Puritans, escaping from persecution in Virginia, sought refuge in Maryland. Clayborne had recovered his island, restored his colony, and now joined the Puritans. The Roman Catholic governor attempted to expel them both. They defeated him, and established themselves at Providence, afterward called "Annapolis." After much more conflict Annapolis was finally ceded to them, with the territory which they held, as a separate county.

Notwithstanding these differences in the beginning, the general progress of Maryland was such that at the death of Lord Baltimore, in 1676, it contained "about sixteen thousand inhabitants, the largest part of whom were Protestants." At the British Revolution of 1688, Lord Baltimore lost his proprietary rights; a royal governor was sent into Maryland, and in 1692 the Church of England was established by law, and tithes were imposed for support of its

clergy upon all the inhabitants, irrespective of their belief.

At the beginning of the eighteenth century, "out of some thirty thousand inhabitants in Maryland, the majority were in communion with the Church of England." Puritan dissenters from Episcopacy in Virginia also removed southward, and formed the earliest permanent settlements in North Carolina. They were strengthened by various additions from New England and Bermuda.

In South Carolina, after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685), a large immigration of French Protestants added an important element to the population. They were followed by companies of Swiss, Protestant Irish and Germans. Among those colonists, some were English Episcopalians; but the greater number were Presbyterians, though speaking different languages. Secondary colonies from South Carolina into Georgia and farther south and west took place at a much later date, and carried with them, as religion, chiefly the faith of the Huguenot and the British Presbyterian, sustained subsequently by new arrivals from Scotland and Germany.

As history went on to unfold what was contained in the seeds thus planted, fruits were borne which doubtless had been expected, but some, also, which no human sagacity could have foreseen. Churches which at first had no recognized existence in the country grew, out of dismembered parts and under severe hardships, into powerful organizations. Others, sustained by the civil government and encouraged by every favor of popularity, barely held their ground.

The belief which had prevailed most obstinately for a thousand years—that in order to be successful a Church must be nursed by the temporal power—practically refuted, withered and fell like an autumn leaf. The American churches, unaided and unfettered, grew to their present proportions by the grace of their Lord alone.

The churches with which the national history began were the Episcopalian, the Dutch Reformed and the Congregational. The system of doctrine held by all alike was the Reformed. All held dependent relations to the state—the Congregational, to their own colonial government; the Dutch, to that of Holland; and the Episcopal ministers were the missionaries of the Established Church of England. British Presbyterians scattered over the land were without organization.

In the charter under which the settlement at Jamestown was made it was required that "the presidents, councils and ministers should provide that the true word and service of God be preached, planted and used according to the rites and doctrines of the Church of England, not only in said colonies, but also as much as might be, among the savages bordering upon them." The Legislature of the colony decreed what was deemed an adequate provision for the clergy out of the products of the soil. A regular system of tithes was afterward instituted.

In 1625, Virginia became a royal colony, and, although the true interests of religion were less carefully regarded, the control of the State over the Church was not relaxed. Under the British Commonwealth the colonists were fortified in adherence to monarchy by the

Cavaliers who found refuge among them. In 1641, Sir William Berkley became governor, and distinguished his royalism by despotic severity to all who differed from his opinions in religion. Commissioners of the Commonwealth arrived in 1651, "and arranged terms of capitulation with the loyalists." Berkley's commission was declared void, and Richard Bennet was appointed to his place.

After the Restoration (1660), Berkley was re-appointed and the Episcopal Church re-established, and persecuting laws were passed against non-conformists, Quakers and Baptists. Berkely carried them out to the letter. Dissatisfaction among the people grew into rebellion (1676), which ended only with the death of its leader, Nathaniel Bacon. For his cruelty Berkley was recalled next year by the not very lenient monarch, Charles II. "The old fool," said the king, "has taken more lives in that naked country than I did for the murder of my father." But the governor thanked God that in the close of his administration there were "no free schools or printing" in his province; "for learning," said he, "had brought disobedience and heresy and sects into the world, and printing has divulged them and libels against the best government. God keep us from both!"

The Rev. James Blair came as a missionary to Virginia in 1685. Four years afterward he was appointed commissary of the bishop of London—an office which he retained for more than half a century, exercising a ruling and benign influence over the province in restoring and enlarging the proper work of the Church. Contrary to the sentiments of Berkley, he founded the

College of William and Mary (1692), and became its first president.

The Church of England in 1704 was established in the Carolinas, although the majority of the people were dissenters. It had already been established (1692) by law over Maryland with her Roman Catholics, Quakers and Presbyterians, and asserted its supremacy among the Dutch Reformed of New York, soon after the surrender of the city, by imposing a public tax for its support. Trinity church was founded in 1696. Its first rector, the Rev. W. Vesey, was also commissary of the bishop of London, under whose oversight were all the Episcopal churches in this country until the Revolution. In New Jersey the same cause was advocated by zealous missionaries of the English Society for Propagating the Gospel, and not entirely without success, although the inhabitants, after the beginning of the eighteenth century, were principally Presbyterians and Quakers. Open toleration was granted to all.

Episcopal ministers were successfully excluded from New England until 1679, when Charles II. caused a church for their use to be erected in Boston, which was afterward endowed by William III. with one hundred pounds annually. Consistent rejection was encountered by persistent proselytism for a hundred years. On the eve of the Revolution there were thirty-six Episcopal churches in the land of the Puritans; and over the whole array of provinces two hundred and fifty. In all cases the Episcopal Church enjoyed the favor, and in some cases the decisive intervention, of the temporal power.

The Dutch settlements on Manhattan Island and at Albany were at first only trading-posts. Few families removed from Holland to settle in America until 1623. Yet there is evidence that a congregation for worship was formed among the occupants of the post at New York as early as 1619. They had no ordained minister for several years. But some of those pious persons commissioned to aid ministers in Holland came over and met the people on Sundays, and read to them the Scriptures, the creeds and the commandments. Their first minister was the Rev. John Michaelius, who preached in New York from 1628 to 1633. His successor, Evrardus Bogardus, "brought with him their first schoolmaster, Adam Roelandsen, who organized the parochial school of the Collegiate Reformed Church."

In the course of a few years other settlements were made on the shores of the harbor, east and west. The Dutch claims extended across New Jersey to the Delaware, which was called "the South River," as the Hudson was "the North." The whole tract received the name "New Netherlands; the post on Manhattan Island was "New Amsterdam," and that on the Hudson at the head of sloop-navigation was "New Orange."

Planted by the Dutch West India Company, the seat of which was at Amsterdam, those settlements came under the classis of that city and the Synod of North Holland. The colonists co-operated with the care extended to them from their native land. Churches were erected and sustained by their own means, and provision was made for ministerial support

in tithes levied by their own government. Before the year 1664 there were churches also at Flatbush, New Utrecht, Flatlands and Esopus, and between 1664 and 1693 others at Schenectady, on Staten Island, at several places on the Hudson and in New Jersey. Thus the Presbyterian Church was first presented to America in the Dutch language.

By the victories of Governor Stuyvesant in 1665 the dominions of Holland were carried over all New Jersey and Delaware, subjugating without suppressing the Lutherans within those bounds. When the English took possession of the territory, in 1664, they guaranteed to the inhabitants all religious privileges. The new conquest was given by the king, Charles II., to his brother James, then duke of York and Albany, in compliment to whom the name "New Amsterdam" gave place to "New York," and "New Orange" to "Albany."

So liberal was the constitution granted by the lords-proprietors of New Jersey as greatly to promote the increase of immigration from New England and the British isles. Nor did the Dutch, although the rule had passed out of their hands, cease to add to their possessions. At the end of nine years the States General of Holland recovered the province, but did not long retain it. In 1674 it was again ceded to England, and in the course of the next seventy years was favored with a large influx of an industrious and religious population.

A law passed in 1693, though not expressly in favor of any one Protestant denomination, proved, under favor of government patronage, to be a practical

establishment of Anglican Episcopacy, and as such was enforced to the subordination of the Dutch Church, which was also within the succeeding period enfeebled by internal causes. Ministers had to be ordained by the Classis of Amsterdam, and all questions of discipline, measures for church extension and difficulties in church-working had to be decided in a distant land by a body of men who had never seen the province and were ignorant of its demands. Large additions successively made to the English-speaking settlers, and the falling off in immigration from Holland, in course of time gave such predominance to the English language that relatively the Dutch became a foreign tongue. Youth of Dutch descent engaged in business, and, mingling in general society, lost familiarity with their own language. Preaching to the understanding of their fathers ceased to be intelligible to them. A compromise divided the work of the Sabbath between the two languages, and as the old people passed away the victory inclined to the more popular rival.

Out of this fettered and divided condition the Dutch Reformed Church found at last a prudent and successful leader in the Rev. John H. Livingstone. Born in New York, educated with a view to the ministry, he completed his course of study in Holland. Before returning to America he conceived a plan for liberating and harmonizing the Church in his native land, and obtained for it the approval of the learned men whom he consulted. His plan was laid before a convention of ministers and elders in New York, October, 1771. Agreed to by them, it was sent to Amsterdam

and certified by the classis there, and was finally adopted and went into operation in 1772. Thus was the Dutch Reformed Church in America constituted under a free and separate organization. A college for the education of her ministers was already founded, in 1770, at New Brunswick.

With seventy congregations in the province of New York and forty in New Jersey, her college in operation, and with a system of inner government independent of foreign authorities, the Dutch Reformed Church, though bearing a foreign name, was on the distinct American footing. At that stage in her history she beheld the colonies in mass transform themselves into an independent nation.

The English Puritans who arrived from Holland landed at Plymouth, in Massachusetts, December 21, 1620. Although soon joined by others of less completely formed views, directly from England, the counsels of John Robinson, which they had enjoyed in Holland, prevailed without being accepted as final among them. Free to worship God according to their understanding of his word, the more recent comers proceeded also to study their Bibles on the subject of Church constitution, as they had already done at home and on the sea, and came with great unanimity to the adoption of that system which has been named "Congregationalism." It is a system which recognizes the Holy Scriptures as the only rule of Christian faith, and the true constitution of the Church to be a congregation of believers "united for worship, the sacraments and discipline," with their elders and deacons. Such a congregation is a com-

plete Church, with all the ecclesiastical authority of which it admits contained within itself. All the brethren have equal right to vote in all the affairs of their own Church. The elders, or ministers, are all of one rank, set apart by the churches, and not possessed of any governmental power as ministers, but only of official power in the churches by which they may be chosen pastors. A communion of Christian brotherhood is maintained among the churches professing the same system of doctrine, and every church is held to be under Christian obligation to fulfill the duties involved therein. Pastors of certain districts also form themselves into associations or consociations, or similar unions, for mutual advice and co-operation in their work. Advice of the association is generally respected, but is of no compulsory authority. Consociation is a closer bond, but has no power to enforce its decisions by legal process.

In their early history the Congregational churches accepted the doctrinal aids of the Reformed Confessions, and in 1648 approved the Confession and Catechisms of the Westminster Assembly.

"The Pilgrims" brought with them no minister, and only one ruling elder—William Brewster. With later arrivals came regularly-ordained clergymen of the Church of England—Puritans, whose design in their native land had been, not to separate from the Establishment, but to work within it for its purer reformation. Liberated from the fetters of civil dictate, they now followed their own Christian convictions. Provision was made for them as pastors, and for all pastors, by law of the colonies. In 1631 it was en-

acted in Massachusetts, and afterward in Connecticut, Maine and New Hampshire, that "no man shall be admitted to the freedom of the body politic but such as are members of some of the churches within the limits of the same." Thus early was Congregationalism established in connection with the state, and before the close of the Synod of Cambridge (1648) all its essential constituents were in active operation. Harvard College had been founded in 1638 for the education of future ministers among the Puritans themselves.

But the law designed to bring all men to the support of the churches, or to exclude from influence in public affairs those who were not believers, wrought some of the worst effects of an Establishment. Subsequently, to meet the complaints of persons thereby disfranchised, the terms of church-membership were lowered. People of sober life were permitted to profess religion and have their children baptized without submitting themselves to examination as to a change of heart and without coming to the Lord's Supper. This "halfway covenant"—proposed at Boston in 1657, ratified by a General Synod in 1662—was not immediately adopted by all the churches (not in Connecticut until 1696), and by many churches and eminent pastors was consistently opposed. But it created a party adverse to all zeal of faith in the essential doctrines of the gospel. A further step was to grant freedom to partake of the Lord's Supper on the same conditions. The controversy lasted long. Good men were to be found on both sides. The venerable Solomon Stoddard, convinced that the Lord's Supper is a converting

ordinance, argued that all baptized persons of reputable life may be admitted, though they may know themselves to be unconverted. Jonathan Edwards, his successor in the same charge, opposed that doctrine; the congregation approved it, and dismissed him.

Connecticut meanwhile took action to confirm her orthodoxy and provide for the higher education within her bounds. The Saybrook College was founded in 1701, in 1718 removed to New Haven, and, out of respect to its liberal benefactor, Elihu Yale, named "Yale College." An assembly of ministers and lay delegates convened, by order of the Legislature of Connecticut, at Saybrook, September 9, 1708, adopted the Savoy Confession, with the slight alterations made at Boston in May, 1680, adding thereto the doctrinal works of the Westminster Assembly and a list of articles for the better regulation of church government and discipline. These acts, comprehended under the name of "the Saybrook Platform," were approved by the Assembly of the colony, which also ordained that all the churches within that government "thus united" should be "owned and acknowledged established by law." Still, the Saybrook Platform was not imposed as binding upon the churches, but only advisory.

From 1708 to the American Revolution is a period marked in the history of Congregationalism by its greatest theologians, among whom stand Edwards, Bellamy and Hopkins; by the evangelical revival under the preaching of Edwards, Whitefield and others; and by the rise and incipient progress of Unitarianism. The revival, from 1734, and again from 1740, greatly increased the number of orthodox churches, and went

to counteract the effects of the Halfway Covenant, among the adherents of which Unitarianism found its readiest converts. Dr. Gay, pastor of the church at Hingham, who began his ministry in 1717, is thought to have been the first preacher in New England to hold Unitarian doctrine, but not to the effect of leading his people to forsake their orthodox profession. He was a strong opponent of the revival. Few ministers followed his example, but among them was Dr. Jonathan Mayhew of Boston. A number of laymen—"tradesmen, farmers, lawyers and physicians"—in a half-covert way favored the heresy. The gains of the revival were great in the increased number of churches, in the strengthening of faith and of the strongholds of theology. But the enemy was mustering his forces and masking his designs. War, with its secular cares and tumults, arose to his aid.

Presbyterianism came into this country by various ways, but chiefly by two—first, as connected with the Congregational settlements; and second, by emigration from Scotland and Ireland. Were it not for their separate organization, the settlers from Holland ought to be called the first American Presbyterians. After the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, Huguenot refugees added to that cause, especially in the South. But both Dutch and Huguenot as well as Welsh failed of making progress by conversion, on account of their foreign language and name. The growth of American Presbyterianism in the English language was without support from the civil government, in some cases encountering its persecution.

The first Puritans in the English Church, and by far the most numerous until the days of the Commonwealth, were Presbyterian. Accordingly, many of the Puritans of New England came from home with their Presbyterian preferences, and as they migrated southward into Long Island and New Jersey assumed in their respective churches the Presbyterian character, but without organic union of churches with authoritative councils. Progress of Presbyterianism from the South, in dissent from Established Episcopacy, was greatly sustained by the arrival of successive emigrations from Scotland and the North of Ireland, landing in Virginia and Maryland. As victims of oppression in their own countries they came severally, without any organic dependence upon the churches at home; but when they sought to form their own ecclesiastical constitution, they followed the model of that which they had left, without being in any way fettered by it. Earliest and most active in the work of organizing the churches in relation to one another was Francis Makemie of Maryland, who arrived from Ireland in 1683. Next to him was Jedidiah Andrews, from Boston, minister of the first Presbyterian church in Philadelphia, which was organized about 1698.

The two Presbyterian streams, proceeding one from the North and the other from the South, united and blended in New Jersey and the neighboring parts of Pennsylvania. The first church of Newark came out of New England. The first Presbyterian church in Maryland came out of Ireland and Scotland, and the first in Philadelphia came partly out of New England.

and partly from Scotland and Ireland. The current from the North excelled in the advantages of a self-protected freedom; that from the South brought to the cause the purpose and plan of a comprehensive Presbyterian organization. Where they met, there the first Presbytery was formed.

In the beginning of the year 1706 seven ministers came together in the church at Philadelphia, of which Mr. Andrews was pastor, and there constituted the first of those Presbyteries which have ever since in unbroken succession represented the Presbyterian Church in America.

Thenceforward congregations multiplied, and connection with the Presbytery, which was slow at first from the northern side, came into increasing favor. At the end of ten years (1716) it was found expedient to divide the Presbytery into three, annex a fourth and constitute a synod. In about twelve years from that date the synod almost doubled its members. Alike from the North and from the South the churches adhered to the same Standards of doctrine, and in 1729, by act of synod, the Westminster Confession and Catechisms were formally adopted, and agreement in opinion with all their "essential and necessary articles" required of all candidates for admission to the gospel ministry under the Presbyteries.

Until after the formation of the synod the ministers of the Presbyterian Church were educated in Europe or in New England. The demand began to be felt for ministerial education among themselves. The first attempt to provide it was made by private means, especially by the Rev. William Tennent, who had

recently arrived from Ireland and accepted the pastorate of a church at Neshaminy, within the Presbytery of Philadelphia. In 1726 he erected a plain structure of logs near his own house for the accommodation of the youth who attended upon his instructions. It was at first ironically called "The College," or "The Log College"—a term which history has ceased to regard as one of reproach.

The great evangelical movement which passed over the Protestant churches of Europe in the earlier part of the eighteenth century had also a spontaneous origin in America. While the "Holy Club" at Oxford was still confined within the university walls, the same benign Spirit was inspiring the preaching of Frelinghuysen in New Jersey, Edwards in Massachusetts and the teachings of the Log College. The sons and pupils of William Tennent became active ministers in the succeeding revival. A division of opinion occurred in the synod on both subjects—education and the revival. One party, called "the Old Side," demanded a European or New England education for the ministry and opposed the revival; the "New Side" favored it, labored for it, and plead first of all things for spiritual experimental religion in their ministers. Between the two arose a third—a mediating—party, in which Dickinson of Elizabeth, Pemberton of New York and Burr of Newark were the leading men.

In 1741 a separation took place. After vain attempts at reconciliation the mediating party in 1745 joined the New Side. Attempts made by the Old Side for a higher education proved unsuccessful. The

New Side, enlarged by addition of churches from the East, formed the Synod of New York, and when, upon the death of William Tennent, in 1746, his Log College came to an end, obtained, through men of the mediating party, from the provincial government of New Jersey, a charter for a regular and better-furnished college, to be planted within their own bounds. The new institution was put under the presidential care of Mr. Dickinson at Elizabeth. A new and better charter was granted by Governor Belcher in 1748, when, after Mr. Dickinson's death, it was removed to Newark and put in charge of Aaron Burr. In 1757 it was removed to Princeton, where a large and substantial building had been put up for its accommodation..

In 1758 the separate branches of the Church, after seventeen years of alienation, succeeded in effecting a cordial and complete reunion.

Within a few years after the formation of the synod, large emigrations of Scotch-Irish Protestants from Ulster, with their ministers, removed to America—some to South Carolina, some to Virginia and some to New England. The latter, kindly welcomed by the governor of Massachusetts, settled in that province, in Maine and in New Hampshire. A presbytery was soon formed among them under the name of "Londonderry."

In the earlier settlements of Virginia, Presbyterians suffered under the persecution leveled against Puritans of every name, and were prevented from associating themselves peaceably in churches; but after the British revolution had wrought some of its effects, and a

new generation had grown up under them, toleration extended also into Virginia. Governor Gooch in 1738 granted to the synod permission to plant churches among the Scotch-Irish recently settled in the Shenandoah Valley. Ministers, accordingly, were sent into that region, who in a few years carried their work southward into the western settlements of North Carolina. Immigrants from Ulster had also planted themselves on the east coast of that province in 1736, followed soon afterward by a colony of Presbyterian Highlanders from Argyleshire, who remained for a number of years destitute of ministers.

In 1745 the preaching of a few evangelical ministers in Virginia was attended by a revival of religion which continued six or seven years, and greatly strengthened the Church in that province and in North Carolina.

Efforts were also made, by co-operation with the Scottish Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, for sending the gospel to the North American Indians. They resulted in three missions—that of John Sargent, to the Housatonic Indians, in 1741; of Azariah Horton, to those upon Long Island, in 1742; and that of David Brainard, in 1743, to those upon the Delaware and Susquehanna Rivers—missions greatly successful. But no church could be permanently sustained among the Indians because of their migratory life. And yet the mission was repeatedly renewed.

As the great epoch of the Revolution drew nigh the Presbyterian Church had her colonies extended over the whole length of the country as then inhabited by European settlers, but, after all that had been

accomplished toward union, still in a fragmentary condition. The Presbytery of South Carolina and those of New England had not yet united with the Synod of New York and Philadelphia. In some places the churches were not united under any presbytery. The Associate churches, the Covenanting churches, the Dutch Reformed, German and French Reformed—all Presbyterian in every essential of their being—stood apart in their own organizations. And yet Presbyterianism was the most numerously professed faith in all the land south of New England. The seat of its best consolidation was the area embracing the provinces of New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania.

At that time the predominant religions were the Congregational, in New England; the Presbyterian, from New England to Delaware, and south of that colony in scattered settlements to South Carolina. Episcopacy held its ground as the Established Church in New York, and from Delaware southward. The Baptists, in their province of Rhode Island, were protected by their civil charter, Romanists by the civil authority of their proprietary in Maryland, and the Quakers had their freedom on the basis of their civil rights in the land they occupied. The only Church disconnected with the temporal power was the Presbyterian, and that in all its various branches.

CHAPTER XXI.

AMERICAN CHURCHES AFTER THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE.

THE American Revolution was provoked by indefensible usurpations of government. Persecuted at home for their scriptural faith and Christian lives, the founders of the American colonies had sought a peaceful refuge in a far-distant wilderness. When industry had made the wilderness a fruitful land, their oppressors followed and attempted to renew the imposition upon their children. To be taxed by a Parliament in which they had no representative was to suffer what a people could not submit to without accepting an absolute master, but to have the oppressor of their fathers set over them with the same usurping authority to forbid their worship and impose upon them a religion chosen by the state, and thus to rob them of their dear-bought freedom to worship God, was more to be deprecated still. The Church of England had already been established by English laws over a great part of the country—even in provinces where its adherents were few—and favored by the civil rulers as entitled to support by taxation of all classes of the people. Revival of the domination of Laud threatened the colonists in their homes; the consecration of an American bishop might crown the despotism at any day; while

a Parliament in a distant land, as arbitrary as Charles I., was imposing taxes upon them in the face of its own constitution. In the crisis of 1775 they were to be coerced into obedience by arms. No alternative remained. Their position as men, religious as well as civil, was threatened. They must defend the cause or forfeit all they valued most and sink beneath their own esteem. Comprehensive of all, they must be independent of a foreign ruler. That ground, once taken, became the theme of the controversy, and, successfully defended, national independence became the consistent spring of all succeeding progress.

The war greatly interfered with the operations of the churches and colleges. Youth withdrew from study to supply the army. The president of Princeton College became one of the wisest counselors in the Revolutionary Congress. Prosperity returned with the return of peace.

PRESBYTERIAN.

Four years after the last battle in the war of independence the growth of the Presbyterian Church led to the adoption of measures for a redistribution of the presbyteries into synods, with a General Assembly, forming a system of church-distribution for the whole United States. In 1788 the plan was satisfactorily carried into effect, and next year the first General Assembly met, in Philadelphia. In the same year (1788) the people of the United States adopted their national Constitution, under which the freedom of the citizen is limited only by express law, and in which no power is given to any branch of the state to legislate in spir-

itual things, or by establishing any denomination of religion to confer a national authority upon it.

The succeeding fifty years was a period in the Presbyterian Church of active prosperity and expansion, including additions to the Assembly from States in the South, of new churches in the West, the founding of theological seminaries, beginning with Princeton (1812), home missions (1816), foreign missions (1831-1837), education, publication (1838) and other agencies for the spread and sustenance of the gospel. Early fraternal relations with orthodox Congregationalists were renewed by various plans of regular intercommunication.

Toward the end of that time a plan of union between Presbyterians and Congregationalists in the Western settlements which had been in operation since 1801 began to create dissension. The feeling on the subject proceeded to such a length that the General Assembly of 1837 passed an act excising all Presbyteries composed of Presbyterians and Congregationalists. With that act a large number of churches outside of the excised synods were dissatisfied. In the Assembly of next year (1838) the controversy issued in a division. The commissioners opposed to the act of excision or sympathizing with the excised synods formed with them what was called the "New School," the other side being known as the "Old School." Litigation was entered into for the inheritance of property, but the case was finally settled by amicable agreement. The two Assemblies continued their evangelical activity and increase in numbers, together with their home and foreign missions and other evangelistic agencies.

As the feelings attendant upon controversy passed away men on both sides began to conceive that the differences between them were not such as to justify continued separation. After careful preliminary consultations the two Assemblies met at Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, on the 10th of November, 1869, and closed their sessions in an entire and cordial reunion.

In 1857 in the New School Assembly, and in 1861 in the Old School Assembly, alienation took place between the Presbyterian churches of the Southern States and those of the Northern. This proceeded from no conflict of doctrine in the bodies, but out of differences of opinion incident to the treatment of slavery and to the civil war—a schism not healed by the restoration of peace. The churches of the South, united in one body, still (1885) retain their separate organization. The different churches of the Presbyterian family comprise in the aggregate about one million two hundred thousand communicants.

Besides the churches in the United States already mentioned, there are others settled by dissenters from the Established Presbyterian Church of Scotland. An Associate church was planted in Pennsylvania (1754), which had grown into a presbytery before the Revolution. Some congregations of Reformed Presbyterians were also constituted in the country about the same time. In 1782 a union was effected between the Associate and Reformed, which took the name "Associate Reformed." But some on both sides declined the union, whereby three different organizations were constituted. The Associate Reformed, which was the

strongest, in 1858 united with the outstanding Associate Church, forming thereby what is now called "the United Presbyterian Church of North America." The union, however, did not take in the whole of either party.

The principal section separated from the Presbyterian Church in the United States on doctrinal grounds is that which arose out of a revival in Kentucky and adjoining regions, designated "the Cumberland Presbytery." By licensing uneducated ministers to meet the demands of new congregations that presbytery fell under censure of the General Assembly. In 1810 it was formed anew, on a separate footing, with modifications of the doctrinal statements of the Westminster Confession of Faith, especially on the doctrines of predestination and atonement. It has since become very numerous and influential in the West, and still bears the name "Cumberland Presbyterian."

Notwithstanding these separations and dissents, the Church which began its American history without organization and without national support finds itself more completely in accord with the national Constitution than any other in the land.

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL.

Anglican Episcopacy, although established in New York, Virginia and the Carolinas before the Revolution, was sustained only as a missionary branch of the Church of England, belonging to the diocese of London and supported by the Society for Propagating the Gospel. In the war of independence the support of the society was withdrawn, and most of the clergy returned to the mother-country.

Upon the conclusion of peace, Dr. Seabury of Connecticut went to England to obtain episcopal consecration. It could not then be granted. From their complication with the state, English bishops were not free to consecrate for foreign countries, and certain oaths were required of the candidate which a citizen of the United States could not take. Dr. Seabury went to Scotland, and from non-juring bishops there, who held no relations to the state, received the desired favor. Subsequently the obstacles in the way of English bishops consecrating for the United States were removed by act of Parliament when, in 1787, Dr. Provoost of New York and Dr. White of Pennsylvania were consecrated by the archbishop of Canterbury. Afterward, in 1790, Dr. Madison of Virginia was consecrated in England. Since that date the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States has been organically separated from that of England. It retains the three ranks of the ministry essential to an Episcopal Church—bishop, presbyter and deacon—but rejects the metropolitan prelacy. Its highest authority is a Triennial Convention, consisting of a house of bishops and a house of deputies, including clerical and lay representatives, the action of the house of deputies being subject to the negative of the house of bishops. From 1789 to 1801 the successive conventions were employed in constituting the system of their Church and in revising the Prayer-Book and the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, which, with some alterations, were accepted.

For the first generation after the establishment of national independence the Episcopal Church lay un-

der extensive popular disfavor. Though Washington was himself an Episcopalian, his coreligionists were, as a whole, inimical to the American cause in the war, and after its close their efforts to secure ecclesiastical relations with England went to confirm the unfavorable opinion thereby generated. At the end of thirty years they were still few and under great discouragement. By the zeal and outgoing piety of some gifted men among them, under the example of the eloquent and indefatigable toiler Bishop Hobart, a new interest was aroused in their community, turning public attention to its Christian character rather than to its political antecedents.

Since those days the history of the Protestant Episcopal Church has been marked by two conspicuous features then assumed—on one hand, a strong conservatism; on the other, a zeal of spiritual progress and of missionary enterprise. The former adheres with severe tenacity to the standards of confession and the established forms in worship, in some cases resting in the extreme of ritualism; the latter, beholding in forms of words and of worship only guides to correct statement of faith and reverence in drawing near to God, have carried their devotion over the land and planted churches from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

In addition to these abiding forces, much division of opinion has been created by agitating questions imported from the Church of England. Tractarianism took but few over to Rome, but it planted seeds where they grow and eat like a cancer. Taking root in moderate ritualism, they corrupt it, and all the Protestant doctrine with which it is connected.

The Protestant Episcopal Church has also been subjected to schism created by counteraction from that extreme. Advocates of a greater simplicity in ritual have felt constrained to withdraw from her communion. Some have done so immediately; others could not without being conspicuous. Such was the case with Bishop Cummins of Kentucky and the Rev. Mr. Cheney of Chicago. The former, for joining in the communion of the Lord's Supper with some Presbyterian ministers and people, and the latter, for omitting the words "regenerate" and "regeneration" in the form of baptism, fell under censure of the Church and of the Episcopal press. On the 2d of December, 1873, Bishop Cummins, with eight clergymen and twenty laymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church, met in the city of New York and organized the Reformed Episcopal Church on the basis of the Prayer-Book issued by the General Convention of 1785. Mr. Cheney was elected bishop, and was consecrated within the month. The justification of this action was placed on the prevalence of Tractarian errors and the development of their effects as "fast absorbing all the vital forces of the Church." The new organization is Reformed alike in worship, in doctrine and in government.

Reformed Episcopalians have ordained a liturgy, and demand its use on regular occasions, but allow also free prayer. Their doctrine is that of the Thirty-nine Articles, but "adapted to present phases of life and thought," and the errors implied in or imputed to the Common Prayer-Book are excluded from the Reformed Book. Their government is episcopal, but

distinctly of law. The bishop is not an apostle who creates the presbyters by ordaining them. He has "no inherent and necessary rights and powers above the legislative control of the Church." "The episcopate is an office rather than a divine order," according to the immediately post-apostolic state of government, in which the presiding brother was a bishop in *office*, but still a presbyter in *order*. The movement is a form of reaction against the excess of ritualism with its implied mediæval errors now prevailing in the Episcopal connection on both sides of the Atlantic.

MORAVIAN.

The great European revival of the eighteenth century, which wrought such benign effects upon the churches of New England and the middle provinces, introduced also two new actors on the scene, neither of whom before the Revolution were churches in America. The Moravians appeared as missionaries, planting stations and schools with a missionary object in view. Houses and lands belonging to the station were the property of the Moravian Church, and were occupied and worked for its interest. This "economy," as it was called, did not absorb private property: it was simply the estate of the Church. There the missionaries who traveled through the country found their home and support, and there was education provided for the young. The village, with its lands and church and school, was "not a settlement," but a foreign institution, and exclusively Moravian. Such were Nazareth and Bethlehem, in Pennsylvania. Some stations were outside of this system. In colo-

nial times they enjoyed undisturbed freedom, for their Church had been recognized by the British Parliament as an episcopal Church affiliated to that of England. Nor was any essential change effected in their relations to the civil government until, in the progress of the national growth, exclusiveness was found impracticable and slowly abandoned. It is only since 1857 that the Moravian province of America has been free to take its place in the sisterhood of American churches.

METHODIST EPISCOPAL.

A few Methodists of the Wesleyan connection came to America between 1760 and 1769. At the latter date their first regular itinerant preachers arrived. In 1773 their first American Conference met, in Philadelphia. So far their societies were still in membership with the Church of England; and that Church, in America, was only a mission from the diocese of London. In the effects of the Revolutionary war and the return of the greater number of those missionaries to their own country the Methodists, like the Episcopalians, were left almost destitute of clergymen qualified to administer the sacraments. Application was made to John Wesley. After much reflection, Wesley resolved to put in exercise the episcopal power scripturally identified with his rank of presbyter, and appointed Dr. Coke from England and Francis Asbury, then in the provinces, to be joint-superintendents to put in order their churches in America. He also ordained Richard Whatcoat and Thomas Vasey to act as presbyters "by baptizing and ministering the Lord's Supper." Upon the arrival of those persons, who came

from England, a convention of the itinerant preachers was called in Baltimore, December 24, 1784, in which the superintendents were accepted as bishops and the American Methodist societies constituted a Church. It was also determined that the episcopal office was to be elective, "and the elected superintendent, or bishop, amenable to the body of ministers and preachers."

Thus the Methodist Episcopal Church was the first of the Wesleyan connection to separate from the Church of England. It was a small body then. The progress of a hundred years has given it the position of the largest church in the United States. Multiplication of numbers has been accompanied by subdivision into sects, but the sum-total of the Methodist connection in the United States, according to the reports of 1880, gives a membership of three million two hundred and eighty-three thousand eight hundred and ninety-three (3,283,893), with a ministry of twenty-one thousand three hundred and seventy-three (21,373). Without government support in the beginning, and under many discouragements afterward, the Methodist Church has been blessed in bringing to the Saviour one-third of all the professing Protestants in the land.

CONGREGATIONAL.

Congregationalists had little to change in adapting their ecclesiastical system to the Constitution of the United States. Next to the Presbyterian, their system corresponded best with that which the nation had chosen for the civil government of the country. With little other alteration than that of providing for their

ministers and for the current expenses of their churches by free contribution instead of by legal taxation—which change was not effected immediately—they carry on their church affairs now as they did before the Revolution.

But during those political changes a great theological change was gradually passing on to its maturity. Unitarianism, which had made its appearance in some churches at an earlier date, in Revolutionary times accelerated its steps and emboldened its utterance. In 1783, before the treaty of peace had yet been signed, the Episcopal church of King's Chapel, in Boston, at the instance of their pastor, James Freeman, erased from their Book of Common Prayer "all reference to the Trinity and the worship of Christ." Some Congregational churches became Unitarian, without the public profession of change, through a gradual drifting on the part of both pastor and people. By such process did the original church of Plymouth in 1801 forsake orthodoxy, while retaining and still using the statements of faith made by their Pilgrim forefathers. In some cases a church divided—one side orthodox, and the other Unitarian. Controversy received intensified activity in 1805 from the election of the Unitarian Dr. Ware to the chair of divinity in Harvard College. In the controversy between Dr. Worcester and Dr. Channing (1815) the two parties came to a sharp separation. Congregations divided in many places and set up their separate churches. In 1816 the Cambridge divinity school was founded by the Unitarians, and Dr. Ware constituted professor of theology. Harvard College came entirely into

their hands. About the same time Dr. Channing became conspicuous among the defenders of that denomination. His eloquence in preaching and writing, his devotional spirit and life, did much to defend his doctrine from the charge of worldliness. And yet the common Unitarianism of his time was far from satisfactory to him. Nor does it meet the earlier expectations of some of its ablest adherents in the present day. Moreover, they are not all of the same type of dissent. Some are Arian, some Socinian, some Sabelian, and perhaps there are other variations, but they agree in rejecting the trinity of Persons in Deity.

Controversy warmed the attachment of the orthodox to their faith and quickened attention and directed discrimination to its doctrines. In Massachusetts, between the years 1825 and 1850, one hundred and forty-six churches were added to the orthodox connection.

The term "Congregational" is claimed as proper only for the orthodox, while Unitarians seem to be contented with their doctrinal designation. The latter are chiefly residents of Boston and the neighborhood, and are few as compared with the orthodox.

BAPTIST.

The Baptist churches of America had their beginning among the Puritans of New England. Roger Williams, an English Episcopal minister, after his arrival in Massachusetts, accepted immersion from Ezekiel Holliman. He then immersed Holliman and ten other persons. Those twelve constituted the nucleus of the Baptist Church in the United States. Laws were enacted against them. Encountering

opposition on all sides, they formed a church on their own principles at Providence, Rhode Island, and in 1644 obtained for their colony a charter securing entire freedom of conscience. In colonial times they were few. Since the establishment of the national independence they have increased to an exceeding great number, being the largest body of Protestants in the land, after the Methodists. But in that process they have also divided into many sects and introduced many varieties of doctrine.

In government the American Baptists are independent; as to doctrine, with the exception of their view of the sacrament of baptism and some inferences which they draw from it, their orthodox churches accept the standards of the other Reformed churches.

LUTHERAN.

Upon the whole, Reformed doctrine prevails as the religion of the United States. Lutherans in colonial times formed not a small element of the population, but, being German and confining themselves to their own language, they also confined their religion to their own settlements. A few mingled with the Dutch Reformed; a few Danes and Swedes on the lower Delaware were all the Lutherans in the country until the German colony of 1710, increased by subsequent additions choosing their residences in various places, but chiefly in Pennsylvania. They came without ministers, and were spiritually almost destitute until the arrival of Henry Melchior Mühlenberg, in 1742, from the Pietist University of Halle when that seat of learning was in its prime. In six years after his

appearance among them he had so highly risen in the esteem of his Lutheran countrymen that, with some of his former associates whom he induced to follow him to the colony, together with two Swedes, he was able to form, in 1748, the first Lutheran Synod in America, which continued to meet annually and to advance the prosperity of their Church. A private theological seminary was opened in 1765, and in 1787 the Legislature of Pennsylvania established Franklin College for the Germans of the State. Other favors were also conferred upon them in acknowledgment of their services in the war of independence.

As the Dutch, so the Germans, had a prolonged controversy among themselves about the language of their public worship. The young people grew up in the use of English, and toward the end of the eighteenth century many of them could not understand preaching in German. As the old people would not permit the introduction of English, the young, in large numbers, went to churches where they could understand what was said. A compromise had to be made. In 1809 a church was built in which English was used exclusively, but successive immigrations from Germany render it still necessary to have also worship in the German language.

Lutheranism in the United States has developed its form of church government to comprehend the large population which now, in the English and German languages, belongs to its communion, and amounts to about half a million.

ROMAN CATHOLIC.

Roman Catholicism was at first an insignificant exception to the Protestant character of the colonies. The charter of Maryland brought only a few hundreds. After the Revolution large addition was made in the acquisition of extensive territories from France and Mexico. Within the last half century the emigrations from Catholic Germany and Ireland have added their hundreds of thousands annually. At the present date that religion claims a population of more than six million, under the complete organization of a primacy at the head of twelve archiepiscopal provinces, with their respective dioceses and sub-bishoprics to the number of sixty-two. The oldest diocese is that of Baltimore, constituted in 1789, created an archbishopric in 1828, and in 1858 the seat of the primacy.

Roman Catholics are most numerous in their provinces of New York, of Cincinnati, of St. Louis, of Boston, of Philadelphia and of Milwaukee. They have always enjoyed the same privileges with other citizens. Their monastic orders—some of them objects of hostile legislation in Europe—have never suffered legal interference in the United States. In relation, however, to the government of the United States and to that of the several States, Roman Catholicism is still a foreigner. It is alien to the national Constitution at various points, and to the spirit of the whole, and is under indissoluble allegiance to a foreign prince who is never reconciled with any party who differs from him, except on the condition of the most implicit submission, and whose decisions in all mat-

ters of faith and morals are irreversible. How much these two heads of faith and morals cover will depend upon the intention of him to whom has been given the sole right to interpret them. It remains to be seen whether long endurance will mollify intolerance or intolerance override her patient competitor.

In Scribner's *Statistical Atlas*, Roman Catholics are said to claim a population of adherents amounting to 6,370,838 within the United States. They make no report of their church-members, but number among their adherents all the members of those families which are in any way connected or affiliated with them. Their adult church-members can scarcely be more than one-third of such adherents, or 2,548,335. The total amount of Protestant church-members is given at 9,517,945. Adding these last two numbers we get 12,066,280 as approximate to the actual number of professing Christians. The Methodists constitute more than one-third of all Protestant church-members, and the Baptists more than one-fourth; Presbyterians come next, counting in also all their sections; the Congregationalists constitute only a little more than four per cent. of the whole Protestant church-membership; the Protestant Episcopal Church has about three and a half per cent.; the Friends have less than one per cent.; the Unitarians, two-tenths of one per cent.; and the Swedenborgians, less than one-tenth of one per cent.

CHURCHES IN CANADA.

America north of the United States was discovered by French enterprise. When, in 1534, James Cartier

first landed on the Canadian coast, he marked it with a double claim in setting up the cross with the arms of the king of France. The act proved symbolical of French history in that land, but eighty years had to elapse before any work under the cross was there begun. In 1615 four Recollet monks arrived in Quebec, and in 1624 a company of Jesuits commenced their career of toil and hardship for conversion of the Indians, while French engineers continued to erect garrisoned forts on every commanding point on the line of conquest westward and southward. Quebec was constituted in 1672 the seat of a bishopric. Until after 1713 the sole representatives of Christianity to the heathen of their neighborhood were the Roman Catholics. In the Treaty of Utrecht, Louis XIV. ceded to Great Britain all his claims to Newfoundland and on the continent of North America except the valleys of the St. Lawrence and of the Mississippi. Finally, in 1763, France surrendered all Canada to Britain under a stipulation that the Catholic clergy were to receive their accustomed rights and dues. But after the transfer to British rule the bishopric of Quebec was practically vacant. It was revived in 1806. The dues could not be enforced upon the whole population to sustain the Romish Church. But the Catholic clergy were allowed to tithe their own people, and, as the mass of the people in the province of Quebec were Catholic, their religion became virtually established there.

Within the present century the religious growth has been greatest on the side of Protestantism, but the Catholic is still the most numerous denomination.

In 1883 they had five archbishops, twenty-five bishops and a population of two million eighty-two thousand eight hundred and ninety-five, resident chiefly in the province of Quebec.

The first Church-of-England congregation was constituted in the chapel of the Recollet monks at Montreal in 1766. In 1791, by an act of the imperial Parliament, three million four hundred thousand acres of the public lands were to be set apart for the endowment of Protestant rectories. Very little of it was so applied. In 1854 an act of the provincial legislature turned the whole over to secular purposes, and thus the idea of establishing a State-Church in Canada was relinquished.

In 1787, Dr. Inglis was appointed by the king the first English bishop of Nova Scotia, and Dr. Mountain in 1793 bishop of Quebec. The see of Montreal was not instituted until 1837. Now the Episcopal Church in Canada has no connection with that of England.

In the interval between 1765 and 1825, beginning with the labors of army chaplains and missionaries from Scotland and England and the United States, and continued by voluntary emigration from various Churches of the Presbyterian name and of the Reformed, the founders of the Presbyterian Church in Canada labored. George Henry in 1765 began preaching to the Scottish soldiers in Quebec. Progress was slow. The first church in Quebec was formed in 1787, the first Canadian presbytery in 1803, and the first synod in 1831. But in Nova Scotia a presbytery had been organized in 1786 and a synod in

1833. The progress accelerated with the settlement of Upper Canada. Churches of so great a variety of ecclesiastical connection, yet substantially the same, sought a formal acknowledgment of their identity. In the issue of several partial unions their separate organizations were reduced to four, comprehending all Presbyterian congregations in Canada except a few connected with churches in the United States. In 1875 all those four took a higher step of union, and on the 15th of June formed themselves into the "Presbyterian Church of Canada," whose jurisdiction now extends from Newfoundland to the Pacific. Only a few dissented from the union.

Congregationalists, in advancing northward from their own country, first settled in Nova Scotia in 1759, but not in Canada until 1801, at which date it appears that a mission was sent to the soldiers at Quebec by the London Missionary Society. Another was sent to Upper Canada in 1810. Their ministers in 1833 were legally recognized by the government. The theological seminary, set up in 1840 at Toronto, was in 1864 removed to Montreal. The number of Congregationalists is still comparatively small.

Methodists emigrated to Canada from both England and the United States. Members of the Methodist Episcopal connection had formed little societies on the Canadian border soon after the war which constituted all to the south of it a foreign country. They were broken up and scattered by the succeeding war of 1812. Renewed by the return of peace, they were disturbed by agents sent out from the English Conference to set in order the Methodist churches after their

system. A revival of religion running through the years 1817 to 1820 promoted their reorganization and greatly enlarged their numbers. The difference between the English Wesleyans and the American Methodist Episcopal led to a division of territory between them, the former taking Lower Canada and the latter the upper province.

While thus separated the Methodist Episcopal branch was organized by the General Conference in the United States into a conference by itself, and four years afterward set apart as an independent Canadian conference under the name of "The Canadian Methodist Episcopal Church." The English Methodist missionaries broke over the conditions of territorial separation, and led to a rupture of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1833—a damage which in subsequent years was partially repaired.

In 1874, Canadian Methodists consisted of four sections: 1. The "Methodist Church of Canada," which was constituted of the former "Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada," the "Wesleyan Methodist Church in Eastern British America" and the "Methodist New Connection Church in Canada;" 2. The "Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada;" 3. The "Primitive Methodist Church in Canada;" and 4. The "Bible Christian Church in Canada." In September, 1882, under a favorable juncture of events and temper of the parties concerned, a combination of all the four was effected in the "Union of Methodist Churches in Canada." The new organization is governed by a General Conference, subordinate to which are ten annual conferences, corresponding to as many provinces of the Dominion.

Two general superintendents hold office for eight years, one being elected every four years. They are responsible to the General Conference for the discharge of their official duties.

The number of communicants in the Methodist Church in Canada is not, relatively to other churches in that country, of the proportions assumed by the denomination in the United States.

The Baptists also have failed in reaching among the Canadians a popularity corresponding to what they enjoy in the more southern country. In 1883 they reported a membership of thirty-seven thousand four hundred and twenty-three, which represents them as fewer than the Methodists, who are inferior in number to the Presbyterians, who in the same respect are surpassed by the Episcopalians, while the most numerous of all are the Roman Catholics.

As in the United States, so in Canada, people take their places in the Christian ranks according to their own convictions, without incurring either profit or inconvenience from the civil government. The law of God is exceeding broad, nor less is the gospel of Christ. Greatest are the victories of the holy word where it has free course—where it is offered to the individual conscience without the prejudice created by civil enforcement. It is entirely competent to its own ends, and always will accomplish those ends most directly where its truths are preached without the aid of compulsion or the inevitable oppression of a State-Church.

CHAPTER XXII.

THE EVANGELIZATION OF THE WORLD.

DURING their first one hundred and thirty years the churches of the Reformation had to establish their right to exist by controversies, often breaking into wars, with external enemies. The next fifty years were occupied with internal conflicts. Freedom for the truth among themselves had so long been their all-absorbing object that when it was secured they did not for a time remember that anything else pertained to Christian duty. In the English societies for the "Promotion of Christian Knowledge" (1698) and for the "Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts" (1701) the home destitution and colonies engaged most of the enterprise; the heathen were only incidentally considered. The Scottish "Society for Propagating Christian Knowledge" (1709) had also a view chiefly to destitute places in Scotland and in the colonies. A few individuals, like Mayhew and Eliot in New England, devoted their labors to the heathen Indians, but the churches were not yet awakened to the duty of giving the gospel to the world. In 1706 two missions were sent to India from Denmark, and King Frederick IV. in 1714 opened his college in Copenhagen for foreign missions. In 1732 the Moravians, reorganized under Pietist auspices, commenced their efforts for the conversion of the world. In 1792 the

English Baptist mission was constituted, with more popular effect than any that had preceded it. The Moravian was a close society; the Baptists plead the cause before the general public.

Since then the interest has been gradually, but not slowly, accelerating and extending to all branches of the Reformation Church. The work is only in its beginning, and a thousand millions of our race are heathen still; yet such is the number of missionary stations, churches and schools as to surround the earth. They have been planted in heathen and Mohammedan countries, in Monophysite countries, in Nestorian communities and among Greek and Roman Catholics. Protestant missionaries are laboring in Italy, in Greece, in Turkey, in Persia, in India, in Burmah, in Siam, in China, and in other lands. Under their hand Australia, New Zealand and the islands of the Pacific Ocean have become a world of Christian states. They are employed on both sides of the Andes. They are in Central America and Mexico. They have set up their standards at various points along the coast of Africa, and now, following the geographical explorer, are planting their stations in the interior of "the Dark Continent." And although this activity is only recent and the laborers at the several points are still few, yet so has the Holy Spirit sustained the efforts made that the number of the converted runs up to the verge of six hundred and fifty thousand, while the altered temper of the heathen world toward Christianity is of vastly greater moment as predictive of the coming change.

Bible societies follow, with their libraries of the Scriptures, actuated by the purpose that the earth

shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord, and that every man shall hear the message of salvation in the language to which he was born.

Other associations of Christian people for other Christian purposes have also multiplied so greatly, and are so multiplying, that all who love the Lord can find a place for the exercise of their talents in his service. The one single theme of revelation which gave unity to all the books of Scripture, which imbued the prayer-hymns of the Middle Ages and dictated the purpose of the Reformation, is warm in the heart of the believer now. Mankind suffers under the delusion of sin and the perversity of the fallen nature arrays itself against the truth, but the brutal force of iniquity is broken. Inquiry prevails. The world is agitated about religion—never so widely and intelligently as at the present day. The multitude are still not believers, but even to the multitude are extending the questions, "What think ye of Christ?"—"Who was he?"—"What has he done?"—"What is he?"—"What is he to us?"

As the human side of Christianity is intellectual and moral, so discussion is the impulse to further and further attainment. The great questions at the present day are those of the Church—in what it consists, and what is essential to its truth—and the historical relations of the person of Christ. Forms of government adopted by Protestant churches, in comparison with Latin and Oriental systems, have brought out more thorough discussion of their apostolic right to exist than ever occurred in earlier times. The primary question now before the world of earnestly-inquiring

men is Christ himself as he really was upon the earth. Before listening to anything else in Christianity our thinking men want to know its Author—to look clearly in upon what he was, what he did, what he suffered and what he meant. As the chief theme in the ancient Greek Church was theology or the doctrine of the Triune God, as that of the ancient Latin Church was anthropology or of man in his natural and covenant relations to God, and as that of the Reformation was the doctrine of salvation through faith in the Redeemer, so in our day it is the doctrine of the Church as it stands—or ought to stand—in relation to Christ, and treated in the light of scientific and historical criticism.

The work of divine grace among men has been, upon the whole, progressive. Its progress has been sustained by hope, and hope has been inspired by divine promise—a promise at each successive epoch of its history fulfilled in all its import for that epoch, and when fulfilled always renewed in a broader and more exalted meaning, Christ, who fulfilled the Old-Testament promise in its Old-Testament significance, illuminated his own instructions with the same promise, more fully revealed and of more exalted spiritual import. Higher and still higher have been the lessons of revelation, and in the later Church more light on truth, more extensive acceptance of the truth, more prevalence of the spirit of Christ, more purity, more happiness in Christian life; and still the believer, following the teaching of his Lord, looks for a more complete fulfillment, and prays, "Thy kingdom come." The sole onward line of human progress for the better is God's way of proceeding with men for their redemption.



INDEX.

- AARON**, 25.
Abraham, call of, 20; promise to, 21; descendants of, 21.
Ahab, 36.
Alexander, 45.
Alexander Severus, 88, 95.
Alogi, the, heretical party, 83.
American churches, planting, 439; after Declaration of Independence, 460; Presbyterian, 461.
Anti-papalism, 423.
Apollinarianism, 133.
Apollonius of Tyana, 92.
Apostles, obscurity of history, 62.
Apostolic Church among the Jews, 55.
Apostolic missions, 57.
Arian controversy, 125.
Arts, revival of, 226, 227.
Athanasian Creed, 154.
Augsburg Confession, 243, 248; peace of, 253.
Augustin, 133.

BAPTISM, burdensome ceremonies, 103.
Baptism by heretics, validity of, 100.
Baptist Church in United States, 472.
Bartholomew's Day, St., 257.

Becket, A., 184.
Bible, English translations, 265, 276, 277.
Bishop of Rome, rank of, 101.
Bishops of Rome, 50, 70.
Bohemia, Reformers in, 259.
British Isles, work in, 155.
Buddha, 41.

CALVIN, JOHN, 256.
Canada churches, 476.
Caracalla, 88.
Catholic reaction, in England, 270.
Celsus, bitter enemy of Christianity, 77.
Chalcedon, Council of, 137.
Chalmers, Thomas, 434.
Charlemagne, 162.
Christ, birth and life of, 51.
Christian Church history, 53.
Christianity, progress of, 74; growing influence of, 91.
Christmas observed, 139.
Chronology, tables of, 106, 118, 128, 141, 148, 157, 167, 176, 203, 219, 232, 326.
Church, Apostolic, among the Jews, 55; severed from Jewish nation, 66.
Church, East and West, divided, 168, 175.

- Church, the, defined, 16.
 Church, the primitive, 15.
 Church and State, union of, 119, 152.
 Clement of Rome, 72.
 Clovis, 146.
 Columba, 156.
 Common Prayer, Book of, 269, 314.
 Confession, private, established, 165.
 Confessions, various, 262.
 Confucius, 41.
 Congregationalism in New England, 311; in United States, 470.
 Constantine, 109, 120, 122.
 Council at Jerusalem, 59.
 Covenant with Abraham, 20.
 Covenant with Noah, 17.
 Covenanters of Scotland, 297.
 Coverdale, Miles, 265.
 Cranmer's Bible, 266.
 Cromwell, 307, 312.
 Crusades, the, 181, 183, 185, 186, 187, 188.
 Cup withheld from laity, 199.
 Cyprian, 98, 101.
 Cyril, 135.
 DAVID, reign of, 33; line of, 38.
 Decius, persecution by, 90, 99.
 Deistic controversy, 426.
 Diocletian, era of, 107, 116, 117.
 Dispersion by persecution, 56.
 Dissenting sects, 200; growth of movement, 228.
 Doctrinal definition, 129.
 Doctrinal reformation in England, 268.
 Doctrine, Christian, statement of, 78.
 Doctrines confirmed, 194.
 Dominic, 197.
 Dort, Synod of, 258.
 ELIJAH, 36.
 Emperors, tables of. See *Roman Emperors*.
 England, Church of, 425; Great revival, 428; recent parties, 431.
 England during the Revolution, 320; under the Restoration, 313.
 English Protestant Church established, 273.
 Equality of ministers, discussion of, 100.
 Eusebius, 114.
 Eutyches, 136.
 FABER, 254.
 Fathers, apostolic, 71; writings of, *ibid.*
 Fichte and his philosophy, 404.
 First day of the week observed, 67.
 Foreign missions, 434.
 Forms of worship, 67, 79, 138.
 France, Reformed Church in, 256, 392, 415.
 Franciscans, 201.
 Free Church of Scotland formed, 435.
 French Revolution, 398, 401.
 GENEVA, Church of, 391; revival in, 414.
 Gentile converts, 59.
 Gnosticism, theory of, 81.
 God, heathen ideas of, 18.

- Greek Catholic Church, 337; in Russia, 339.
 Gustavus Adolphus, 260.
- HADRIAN, 75, 76.
 Haldane, Robert, 414.
 Hegel, his philosophy, 405.
 Heidelberg Catechism, 258.
 Henry at Canossa, 180.
 Henry VIII., 263, 266.
 Heresy, methods for preventing, 202.
 Hildebrand, 171, 177; elected pope, 178.
 Holland, Church formed in, 281; Reformed Church of, 394-417.
 Holy days, increase of, 96, 139.
 Holy Spirit, procession of, 160.
 Hungary, Protestantism in, 390.
 Hus, John, 213.
- IMAGES, origin of, 18; worship of, 158.
 Indulgences, 224.
 Inquisition, 202.
 Invention of compass, 227.
 Ireland during Revolution, 323; Presbyterian Church in, 436.
 Irenæus, treatise of, 77.
 Israel, training of, in wilderness, 24; entering Canaan, 26; portions of the tribes, 28; theocratic government, 29; punished for unfaithfulness, 29.
- JACOBI, FREDERICK HENRY, 409.
 Jansenism, 353.
 Jeroboam, king of revolted tribes, 35.
 Jerome, 132.
 Jerusalem destroyed, 65.
- Jesuit order, 253.
 Jesuitism, origin of, 359.
 Jews in Babylon, 42; return to Judea, 43, 44.
 John banished, 66.
 Justin Martyr, 76.
- KANT, EMMANUEL, 402.
 Knox, John, 284.
- LATIN hymns, 203.
 League of Smalcald, 248, 250.
 Learning, restoration of, 161.
 Literature, Christian, 98, 203.
 Liturgy in Scotland, 295.
 Lollards, 212.
 Long Parliament, the, 302.
 Lord's Supper, superstitions about, 104; Luther's doctrine of, 246.
 Loyola, 253.
 Luther, Martin, 230, 233, 235, 250, 251.
 Lutheran Church in United States, 473.
 Lutheran clergy, new revival among, 409.
 Lutheranism, 376.
- MAGNA CHARTA, 186.
 Manicheism, origin, 116.
 Marcus Aurelius, persecution under, 78.
 Maronites, 335.
 Martyrdom, importance attached to, 96.
 Martyrs, intercession of, invoked, 139.
 Melancthon, 240.
 Mendicant orders, 197.
 Methodist Episcopal Church, 430-469.

- Middle Ages, 146.
 Ministerial equality, 100.
 Missionary enterprises advanced by arms, 174.
 Mohammed, 147.
 Monarchianism, 92.
 Monasticism, 123, 139, 173, 196.
 Monophysite controversy, 144.
 Monophysites, 333.
 Monotheistic reform, 23.
 Monothelite doctrine, 154.
 Montanism, heresy of, 82.
 Moravians, 382, 468.
 Moses, infancy of, 22; death of, 26.
 Music introduced in worship, 34.
 Mystics, 214.

 NEANDER, 411.
 Neo-Platonist philosophers, 114.
 Nero, 64.
 Nestorians, 332.
 Nestorius, 134.
 Netherlands, Reformation in, 250; persecution in, 257.
 New England, 311.
 New Testament, Tyndale's translation, 265.
 Nice, Council of, 126.
 Noachic Covenant, 17.

 OFFICERS in early Church, 72.
 Orders, mendicant, 197; free, 198.
 Oriental churches, 331.
 Origen, writings of, 86; doctrines, 93, 125.

 PAPACY, the, 364, 420.
 Papal degeneracy, 168; decline, 206.
 Papal prosperity, summit of, 177.
 Patriarchal rivalry, 142.
 Patrick, St., 155.
 Paul as a missionary, 58; trials, 61; last labors and death, 62.
 Paulicians, 160, 200.
 Pelagius, 131.
 Penances, system of, 174.
 Pentecost, day of, 55.
 Persecution in England, 271, 272.
 Persecution in Scotland, 285, 317.
 Person of Christ, opinions about, 92, 137.
 Philosophy, a new, 402.
 Pietist revival, 377.
 Pilgrims, 450.
 Pliny, 74.
 Political changes affecting the churches, 372.
 Pope reaching full power, 152, 158.
 Popes, list of, 128, 141, 148, 157, 167, 176, 205, 219, 232, 326.
 Porphyry, 114.
 Preaching, the first, 63.
 Presbyterian Church in America, beginning of, 453; first Presbytery, 455; after 1776, 461.
 Presbyterian Church in England, 308; in Scotland, 310, 432; in Ireland, 311; in America, 453.
 Presbyterian Church in Scotland, 290, 294; since 1688, 432; secession from, 433; branches of, 436.
 Promise, the first, 15.
 Prophets, 44.
 Protestant, origin of name, 242.
 Protestant churches, 376.
 Protestant Episcopal Church, 464.
 Protestantism in Hungary, 390.
 Prussia, Church of, 411.
 Psalms in metre, 266, 305.

Puritans, 200, 280, 293.

Puritan and Episcopalian controversy, 277, 292.

QUIETISM, 357.

RATIONALISM, 379.

Rationalist revolution, 397.

Recent religious progress, 375.

Reformation, the, 233.

Reformation in Switzerland, 244;
in England, 263; in Scotland,
283; in Ireland, 298.

Reformed churches, the, 388.

Religion, forms of, after Deluge,
18.

Religion in ancient records, 13.

Religions, Oriental, 42.

Revival in Reformed churches, 414.

Revolt of ten tribes, 35.

Robespierre, 399.

Roman Catholic Church, 352; state
of religious intelligence in, 369.

Roman Catholic Church in United
States, 476.

Roman emperors, tables of, 50, 70,
106, 118, 128, 141, 148, 157.

Roman Empire, decline of, begins,
87.

Roman hierarchy, growth of, 107,
112, 121.

Rome, bishops of, 50, 70, 106, 118.

SABELLIUS, teaching of, 133.

Samuel, judgeship of, 30.

Saul, first king of Israel, 30.

Schelling's philosophy, 406.

Schleiermacher, his teaching, 409.

Scholasticism, 190.

Schools, Christian, 85.

Schools of the prophets, 32.

Scotland, Established Church of,
432; Free Church, 435; Re-
formed Church in, 287; under
Restoration, 315; during Revo-
lution, 321.

Scriptures forbidden to laity, 202.

Secrecy in worship, 96.

Septimius Severus, death of, 88.

Sinai, revelation at, 24.

Socrates, 41.

Solemn League and Covenant,
304.

Solomon, reign of, 34.

St. Bartholomew's Day, massacre,
257.

Stylite saints, 145.

Swedenborgianism, 386.

TENNENT, WILLIAM, 455.

Ten tribes, departure from God,
35; idolatry introduced, 36;
kingdom destroyed, 36.

Tertullian, works of, 98.

Theodosius, 126.

Thirty Years' War, 258.

Transubstantiation first taught, 160;
controversy about, 191.

Trent, Council of, 255.

Trial by ordeal, 174.

Tyndale, William, 265.

UNITARIANS, 430.

VIRGIN MARY, worship sanctioned,
138; assumption of, 165.

WALDENSES, 196, 201.

Wars, religious, 248.


Wartburg Castle, Luther in, 239.


Wesleys, the, 429.

Westminster Assembly, 303.

- | | |
|--|---|
| Westphalia, Treaty of, 328.
Whitefield, George, 429.
Wolfenbüttel Fragments, 384.
World, evangelization of, 482.
World, the, at Christ's advent, 45-48.
Worms, Luther at, 239.
Worship, forms of early Christian, 74; places of, 95. | Worship of Virgin' Mary sanctioned, 136; additions to rites, 224.
Wycliff, 212, 263.
XAVIER, 254.
ZERUBBABEL, 43.
Zwingle, 244. |
|--|---|

THE END.







89097204481



B89097204481A

1000
1000
1000

89097204481



b89097204481a